FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE

Daily Report

Central Eurasia

FBIS-SOV-93-078
Monday
26 April 1993

Daily Report
Central Eurasia

FBIS-SOV-93-078 CONTENTS *26 April 1993*

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

INTERREGIONAL AFFAIRS

- Shaposhnikov Interviewed on CIS Military Issues *[Moscow TV]* 1
- Armed Forces Deputy Favors Pooled Military Efforts *[ITAR-TASS]* 4
- ITAR-TASS Carries Press Review for 24 Apr 4

RUSSIA INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

- Churkin Outlines New Proposals on Yugoslav Crisis *[ITAR-TASS]* 6
- Government To Support Sanctions Against FRY *[ITAR-TASS]* 6
- Kozyrev on 'Unorthodox' Plan To Mediate in Sarajevo *[SEGODNYA 23 Apr]* 6
- Additional Transport Detachment Leaves for Bosnia *[Russian TV]* 7
- Foreign Ministry Announces Plans To Recognize Macedonia *[ITAR-TASS]* 7
- Yeltsin Warns Latvia About 'Ethnic Cleansing' *[ITAR-TASS]* 7
- Latvian Parliament Actions Seen Dooming Talks *[ITAR-TASS]* 7
- Foreign Ministry Welcomes U.S. 23 Apr Statement *[ITAR-TASS]* 8
- 'Itogi' Program Covers Link Between U.S. Aid, Reform *[Moscow TV]* 8
- Foreign Ministry Welcomes Arab-Israeli Talks *[ITAR-TASS]* 8
  - Foreign Ministry Aide Comments *[ITAR-TASS]* 9
- 'Arafat Seeks Yeltsin's Help on Palestinian Issues *[ITAR-TASS]* 9
- Ostankino Representative Talks With PLO Official *[Moscow International]* 9
- U.S.-DPRK Talks May Ease Tension on Korean Peninsula *[Moscow International]* 10
- Paper Reports Japan To Adopt 'Soft Stand' on Kuril Issue *[ITAR-TASS]* 10
- Japan Offers Help for Defense Industry Conversion *[ITAR-TASS]* 11
- Deputy Foreign Minister Discusses Role in UN *[Moscow TV]* 11

RUSSIA NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Referendum Issues

- Official Activity Before Referendum Reported 13
  - Yeltsin Reads Message to Sverdlovsk *[Moscow TV]* 13
  - Yeltsin Addresses Nation *[Moscow TV]* 13
  - Yeltsin Order on Referendum in Armed Forces *[ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI 24 Apr]* 15
  - Court Rules on Vote Counting *[ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI 23 Apr]* 15
  - Khasbulatov on Court Decision *[Russian TV]* 16
  - Kozyrev on Ties With International Community *[ITAR-TASS]* 16
- Voting Begins for 25 April Referendum 17
  - Yeltsin Votes at 0800 *[Radio Rossii]* 17
  - Early Appearance 'Unexpected' *[ITAR-TASS]* 17
  - Violations Reported *[Moscow Radio]* 17
  - Exit Polls Show Confidence in Yeltsin *[Moscow TV]* 18
  - Confusion Reported in Khabarovsk Kray *[Khabarovsk Radio]* 18
  - 'No Complications' in Vladivostok *[Russian TV]* 18
  - North Ossetians Voting *[ITAR-TASS]* 19
  - Prisoners Voting in Favor of 'Freedom' *[Moscow TV]* 19
- Russian Citizens Vote Outside of Federation 19
  - Voting in Tallinn 'Organized' *[ITAR-TASS]* 19
  - Citizens Vote in Baltics *[ITAR-TASS]* 19
  - Russians Vote Throughout CIS *[ITAR-TASS]* 20
- Conflicting Views on 'Irregularities' Reported *[Moscow Radio]* 20
  - Confusion Over Ballot Validity *[Moscow Radio]* 20
  - Violations of Law Uncovered *[ITAR-TASS]* 21
  - Popov Reports No 'Breaches' *[ITAR-TASS]* 21
  - Observers Report No 'Excesses' *[ITAR-TASS]* 21
  - Instances of Irregularities Detailed *[Russian TV]* 22
  - U.S. Observers: 'No Gross Violations' *[Radio Rossii]* 22

  - 'Majority' of Voting Without 'Violations' *[ITAR-TASS]* 22
- Preliminary Figures Observed 25 Apr 23
  - Siberian Region Figures Given *[Radio Rossii]* 23
  - Polls Close in East *[Moscow TV]* 23
  - Orenburg, Krasnoyarsk, Novosibirsk Report *[Moscow Radio]* 23
  - 70 Percent Vote in Yakutia *[Moscow TV]* 24
  - Several Regions Give First Results *[Moscow TV]* 24
  - More Referendum Results Announced *[Moscow Radio]* 24
  - Khabarovsk Kray Results Given *[Radio Rossii]* 24
  - 59 Percent of Moscow Electorate Votes *[Radio Rossii]* 25
  - Early Results Show Majority for Yeltsin *[Moscow TV]* 25
- More Preliminary Results Reported 26 Apr 25
  - Results From Embassies Abroad *[Radio Rossii]* 25
  - Results From Kuzbass Region Noted *[Moscow Radio]* 25
  - Roundup of Regional Voting *[ITAR-TASS]* 26
  - Further on Regional Results *[ITAR-TASS]* 28
  - Referendum Held 'Successfully' *[ITAR-TASS]* 30
  - Electoral Commission Head Details Results *[Moscow Radio]* 30
  - Tver, Novgorod, Saratov Report *[Radio Rossii]* 31
  - Preliminary Results From Sverdlovsk *[Radio Rossii]* 31
  - St. Petersburg Results Reported *[Moscow Radio]* 32
  - Mordovia Results Reported *[Radio Rossii]* 32
  - Further TASS Roundup *[ITAR-TASS]* 32
  - Kalmykia Voting Results *[Russian TV]* 33
  - 'Observer' Comments on Results *[ITAR-TASS]* 33
- IZVESTIYA Gives Preliminary Results of Vote *[27 Apr]* 33
  - Cites Voting Figures *[27 Apr]* 34
- Yeltsin Said Studying Referendum Results *[ITAR-TASS]* 35
- Official Reaction to Voting, Results 35
  - Rutskoy Speaks With Journalists *[Moscow TV]* 35
  - To Reveal Facts on Corruption *[Radio Rossii]* 36
  - Zorkin on 'Legal Consequences' *[Russian TV]* 36
  - Comments on Voting *[Moscow TV]* 36
  - Supports 'Law-Governed' Parliament, Court *[ITAR-TASS]* 36
  - Khasbulatov, Others Comment *[Moscow TV]* 36
  - Sees No 'Catastrophic Changes' *[ITAR-TASS]* 37
  - Comments on Vote Counting *[Moscow Radio]* 37
  - Chernomyrdin Against Coalition Government *[ITAR-TASS]* 37
  - Kostikov Says Yeltsin 'Pleased' *[Radio Rossii]* 37
  - Yemalyanov Warns Politicians *[ITAR-TASS]* 39
  - Shakhray, Poltoranin, Burbulis Interviewed *[Moscow TV]* 39
- Commentary Views Yeltsin's 'Moral' Victory *[Radio Rossii]* 40
- International Community Reacts to Outcome 40
  - Japan Welcomes Yeltsin's 'Victory' *[ITAR-TASS]* 40
  - Britain, Germany Welcome Results *[ITAR-TASS]* 41
  - German Minister Comments *[ITAR-TASS]* 41

Political Issues

- Yeltsin Strips Rutskoy of Land Reform Task *[ITAR-TASS]* 41
- 'Obligatory Checks' To Be Run on Top Officials *[Moscow TV]* 41
- Yeltsin Introduction to Draft Constitution Published *[IZVESTIYA 24 Apr]* 42
- Supreme Soviet Chairman on Referendum, Other Issues *[Russian TV]* 42
  - Filatov, Chubays React *[Russian TV]* 49
  - Communications Minister Dismisses Remarks *[Russian TV]* 49
- Zorkin Interviewed on Current Situation *[Radio Rossii]* 50
- Government Criticizes Rutskoy's Role as IDC Chairman *[ITAR-TASS]* 57
- Rutskoy Statement on Ostankino's Refusal of Airtime *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 24 Apr]* 58
- 'Excerpt' of Interview With Rutskoy on Politics *[Moscow TV]* 58
- Rutskoy Differs With Yeltsin on Tactics, Not Strategy *[KURANTY 24 Apr]* 59
- Rutskoy Outlines Views on Country's Present, Future *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 23 Apr]* 60
- Kotenkov Accuses Rutskoy, Stepankov of Illegalities *[ITAR-TASS]* 65

Rutskoy Allegations on Western Group Corruption Refuted *[Moscow TV]* 66
Shokhin Disputes Rutskoy Claim on Capital Flight *[IZVESTIYA 24 Apr]* 67
Nature of Rutskoy Revelations Viewed *[IZVESTIYA 23 Apr]* 68
Yeltsin Appoints Three New Officials *[ITAR-TASS]* 69
Yeltsin 'Instruction' Turns Over Church Property *[ITAR-TASS]* 69
Anti-Yeltsin Rally Held in Moscow 23 Apr *[ITAR-TASS]* 69
Isakov, Terekhov Named Heads of Activist Committee *[KURANTY 23 Apr]* 70
Presidential Administration Head Interviewed *[Moscow Radio]* 70

Supreme Soviet

Khasbulatov Interview on Referendum *[Radio Rossii]* 77
    Says Referendum Results To 'Split' Country *[Moscow Radio]* 79
    Yeltsin Secretary Rejects Remarks *[ITAR-TASS]* 80
Khasbulatov Views Possible Referendum Outcomes *[ITAR-TASS]* 80

Regional Affairs

Yeltsin Attends Housing Opening for Afghan Veterans *[ITAR-TASS]* 81
Chechen President 'Fully in Control;' Rallies Continue *[ITAR-TASS]* 81
Chechen President Calls For Stabilization *[ITAR-TASS]* 81
Dudayev Supporters Take Over Airport, Other Sites *[Moscow Radio]* 82
Chechen Power Crisis Analyzed *[NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA 24 Apr]* 82
'Tense' Situation in Ossetia-Ingushetia Zone *[ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI 23 Apr]* 83
Sakhalin Governor on Solution of Islands Dispute *[Tokyo KYODO]* 84

UKRAINE

International Affairs

Kostenko Denies 'Dragging Out' START Ratification *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 24 Apr]* 85
    Says Disarmament Requires Foreign Aid *[Kiev International]* 85
Kravchuk Aide Urges Meeting With Yeltsin in Sevastopol *[NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA 23 Apr]* 85
Crimean Parliament Adopts Resolution on Black Sea Fleet *[Kiev International]* 86
    Invites Yeltsin, Kravchuk to Sevastopol *[NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA 24 Apr]* 86
Naval Officers Issue Appeal Over Black Sea Fleet *[Kiev International]* 87
Kuchma News Conference on Mideast Visit, Other Issues *[UKRINFORM]* 87
    Views Military Cooperation With Gulf States *[NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA 24 Apr]* 87

National Affairs

Parliament Continues Discussion of Military Doctrine *[NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA 24 Apr]* 88
    Decides To Amend Doctrine *[Moscow International]* 89
Kravchuk Meets Cossacks, Says Ukraine To Be 'Strong' *[Kiev International]* 89
Kravchuk Wants Better Aid for Chernobyl Victims *[ITAR-TASS]* 89

CAUCASUS

Azerbaijan

Elchibey Reviews Talks With Ter-Petrosyan *[TURAN]* 90
    'Too Early' To Discuss Results *[AZERTAC]* 90
Elchibey Holds Briefing, Says Russia Prolonging Conflict *[TURAN]* 90
U.S. Embassy Delivers Note to Foreign Ministry on Conflict *[TURAN]* 90
Presidential Adviser Receives Visiting CSCE Delegation *[TURAN]* 91

Georgia

Russian Forces Protest 'Unauthorized Seizures of Property' *[ITAR-TASS]* 91
Chikvaidze, Russian Envoy Call For Abkhazia Talks *[Tbilisi Radio]* 91
'Sources' Say Russia To Help Storm Sukhumi *[CONTACT INFORMATION AGENCY]* 91
Abkhazia Welcomes Tbilisi's 22 Apr Call To End War *[ITAR-TASS]* 92
Kitovani Signs Military Censorship Law *[ITAR-TASS]* 92
Gamsakhurdia Supporter Joins Kitovani Forces *[SNARK]* 92
Shevardnadze Meets With CSCE Mission Chief *[Tbilisi Radio]* 92
Shevardnadze, Turkey's Demirel on Yerevan-Baku Mediation *[NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA 23 Apr]* 92

Shaposhnikov Interviewed on CIS Military Issues

LD2504162393 Moscow Ostankino First Channel Network in Russian 1420 GMT 23 Apr 93

[Report on interview with Air Marshal Yevgeniy Shaposhnikov, commander of CIS Joint Armed Forces, by announcer Ilyashchenko, including recordings of portions of Shaposhnikov remarks and of reports from correspondents in Belarus and Tajikistan; place and date not given]

[Text] [Ilyashchenko] As is known, the collective security treaty was signed a year ago, but to a certain extent, it still remains just a political declaration. What is your idea of the collective security system and do you expect your concrete plans and decisions to be implemented at the next CIS summit?

[Shaposhnikov] When a single state has ceased to exist, the existence of the single armed forces was put into question, and from the very beginning we had a concept of the joint armed forces. We did not want to change anything and just wanted to continue with the same tasks, the same functions. At the same time we wanted to set up a transitionary period in which to tackle all the problems—first of all, social, operational, materiel, and technical—in a civilized and calm way, over a period of three to five years. As we know, some laws were adopted, laws that say: The Ukrainians should be doing their service in Ukraine, the Uzbeks in Uzbekistan, etc. And while these processes were going on, something like Ukrainization, Belarusification of the army would happen by itself, each of the separate armies would gradually take shape. In the meantime, we would be gradually transferring the officers from one state to the other, and so on. But we did not succeed in transforming the army into the joint armed forces, because the same disintegrational processes were at work here and because of the legislative acts on the questions of defense adopted by the parliaments of some CIS countries in a rush, without consultations with other member states. This, of course, was partly due to personal ambitions among the leaders of some states and people in their military departments.

[Ilyashchenko, over archive video] But the ice was broken only a year ago. The collective security treaty between the CIS countries—and not even all of them—was finally signed on 15 May 1992 in Tashkent, but the problem is that it has in practice remained just a piece of paper. Up to now it has not been ratified by the parliaments of several states, including Russia. There are many reasons for this. One of them, Marshal Shaposhnikov admitted, is that the treaty would give too much power to the Joint Armed Forces' supreme command. Obviously, the fear of becoming dependent on the new center is still strong in some republics.

[Shaposhnikov] I should like to state that I am fighting for the CIS, for CIS collective security, for integration of the economy and defense and not for my own chair, nor to be able to have power over everybody, as it is being sometimes alleged in the media. No, all this is in the interests of the peoples and in the interests of the armed forces.

There are several aspects to this. The first aspect is the economic one. I think I would will divulge such a big secret if I say that within the former USSR 60,000 enterprises were working for the military economy. They were grouped around nine different ministries. Of these enterprises, only 2,000 were manufacturing finished products. And today these enterprises have found themselves in different situations. Some 70 percent, nearly 80 percent of these are in Russia and the rest are in other CIS states. By the way, in Russia some statements appear now to the effect that we should be solving all the economic questions on a bilateral basis. This should be based on the principle of specific interests—arrange a deal on coal with one country, on gas with the other, on oil with the third, on timber with the fourth, on wheat with the fifth, on cotton with the sixth, and so on.

Here I should like to ask the esteemed gentlemen from the Russian government: You also have bilateral relations with African, Latin American, and southeastern countries on coffee, on cotton, on bananas and pineapples. These countries are not CIS members. But how do you imagine we can build a military economy in the CIS states on a bilateral basis? Take an aircraft, which is a compound product of about 560 enterprises. Out of these, 520 are on the territory of Russia and the rest are on the territories of other states. Will you then be making separate deals with each of the states? With one—on the blades for the engine turbines, with another—on the fuel injection systems, with a third—on the wheels for the undercarriage? No, we should be creating some kind of a single mechanism here, some sort of a corporate system.

[Ilyashchenko] And many people are now saying, in connection with this, that in some of these independent states there is a shortage of even basic weapons, uniforms, and many other things.

[Shaposhnikov] At the same time everyone is trying to snatch a bigger slice of the pie. Let's take Ukraine, for example. It has taken on a very large army for itself, and cannot even maintain it yet. To speak bluntly, it looks like it has swallowed more than it can chew. What does Ukraine want to do with such a large Black Sea Fleet which it currently demands? When they cannot even repair their agricultural equipment which at the moment stands idle while they have nothing to sow with? But the fleet requires very large investment and spending. Or take their aviation, half of which is grounded at the moment for the same reason.

What I think is this. We have created the CIS, and naturally it is an association of states, free from ideological constraints, free from a rigid diktat from the center. On the whole this should contribute to improving living conditions for our peoples, and service conditions in the armies for our officers and servicemen in general, but in fact, what we have got is the opposite. Therefore it seems appropriate to make use of our experience of old, only in a new form.

This is what guides me in my attempts to transform our CIS into a powerful, viable, and effective mechanism, the end result of which should be the setting up of an economic and defense alliance, but mind you, no one should be forced to be part of it.

[Ilyashchenko, over video showing two opposing rallies in a square in Minsk] It is well known that Belarus did not sign the collective security treaty. Should it join the treaty, or should it stick to the strategy of neutrality? In April, this dilemma took the form of an open confrontation between political forces, both in the Belarus parliament and outside it. Our Minsk correspondent Aleksey Zhuk reports.

[Zhuk, over video of soldiers marching on parade and an oath-taking ceremony] The state that proclaims sovereignty ought to have a national army. In Belarus, the establishment of the armed forces is being carried out in accordance with decisions of supreme state authorities. A first motorized brigade has been set up. In units throughout the republic, soldiers and officers have taken an oath of allegiance to the Belarus people. In this process, one quite important aspect has been taken into account—the oath was taken on a voluntary basis, without any pressure.

[Stanislav Shushkevich, chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Belarus, interviewed at the oath-taking ceremony] All the issues concerning servicemen transferred from the Western Group of Forces have been unambiguously resolved by our Supreme Soviet. They have been given an opportunity to take the oath of allegiance if they want to. If they don't, nobody forces them. Firstly, specialist personnel with rare qualifications have the option of serving on contract. The Defense Ministry is using this form of service. And finally, servicemen have freedom of choice. If they don't want to serve here, they have had six months to choose where they do want to serve. Many have left, but this is not a mass phenomenon. More have come here. We are proud of the fact that more people are attracted here than drawn away. I regard this as a confirmation that our government, our Supreme Soviet have chosen a correct course.

[Zhuk, over video of Belarus Supreme Soviet session] The key question at the latest emergency session of the Supreme Soviet was whether the republic should join the CIS countries' collective security treaty. After sharp debates, a majority decision was taken to instruct the chairman of the Supreme Soviet to sign the document, registering those reservations that had been adopted. [Video shows voting results display reading "188 for, 34 against, 30 abstentions"] That's to say that without the consent of the Supreme Soviet no Belarus soldier will be sent outside the republic, and neither can the troops of other states be deployed or used on the territory of Belarus. At Stanislav Shushkevich's proposal, the parliament decided to include the issue of a referendum on the agenda for the next session. As he stated, the citizens themselves ought to decide in a nationwide vote whether Belarus should enter the collective security system.

[Ilyashchenko, addressing Shaposhnikov] A number of states believe that in setting up a collective security system we should use the well-known NATO experience, others favor the experience of the Warsaw Pact. What about you, what is your inclination? What is your concept on this point?

[Shaposhnikov] Of course, one cannot physically, crudely and thoughtlessly transport someone else's experience into our reality. In general terms, no experience can be absolutely suited to our conditions, be it the French, the German, the American, the Swedish, the Japanese experience, or any other. That is a general idea, and the same goes for the economic aspect. In military-political terms, we do have several concepts. The points of view are as follows. The first point of view, option one, is this: Let us do something along the lines of the Warsaw Pact. What does that imply? In the Warsaw Pact, the commander of the joint armed forces was also the first deputy defense minister of the Russian Federation—I beg your pardon, I meant the Soviet Union, of course. With all the equipment, ideology, tactics, operational art and science, and so on. But there was one unifying feature, the so-called communist ideology, which consolidated all these states. Today we have nothing of the sort.

The second option, the NATO one, can be acceptable in our conditions. But we should use new features, compared to what used to exist in the Warsaw Pact and what exists in NATO.

[Ilyashchenko, over video of a NATO meeting, Shaposhnikov visiting NATO headquarters] The NATO-style structure is favored by a number of states, namely Armenia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, and Tajikistan. What are their arguments? The NATO High Command is an inter-state military and political body. It plays first and foremost a coordinating role, without in any way infringing the sovereignty and the independence of its member states. A NATO-style structure is less vulnerable in political terms, it would not give any grounds for accusing Russia of imperial ambitions. Another important aspect is that all decisions in NATO are adopted by members of the alliance solely on the basis of consensus. This means that even the smallest country has an equal say with the most powerful state.

Marshal Shaposhnikov has visited NATO headquarters. He had discussions and consultations with its leaders. His vision of the military-political organ of the CIS Joint Armed Forces is a council of collective security of the states that are signatory to the treaty. This council would be made up of heads of states and governments, and backed by a council of defense ministers. Various committees, along the lines of the NATO structure, are envisaged, to deal with nuclear and operational planning. [addressing Shaposhnikov] I know that you have been the initiator of the idea to set up peacemaking forces. How is it being implemented, has there been any movement on that? I mean specifically, what can be called the southern front of the CIS.

[Shaposhnikov] You are quite right, and if we had done this in good time, perhaps we would have prevented events which have had dreadful consequences in the current hot spots. First, I proposed that the CIS states with an unstable situation should refrain from setting up their own armed forces. Second, I proposed an immediate creation of peacemaking forces. This process did not take off either. Later President Nazarbayev raised this issue at a scheduled conference, and the decision was taken to set up the peacemaking forces, but the mechanism of their deployment is so complicated and inflexible—due to our disease, those numerous bureaucratic phenomena—that in fact it is difficult to resolve the matter at present. Today in fact only the Russian Armed Forces are being used as peacemaking forces—in Moldova, in South Ossetia, also on Russian territory, namely in Ingushetia and North Ossetia, as well as in Tajikistan.

[Ilyashchenko, over video of a mountain landscape] Our special correspondent Andrey Murtazin has just returned from the Tajik-Afghan border.

[Murtazin, over video of a mountain landscape, servicemen disembarking from a transport plane, a group of servicemen leaving a building with a plaque reading "Headquarters" and a Russian tricolor on top] The Pamir mountains. Here at an altitude of 2,500 meters above sea level, lies the Tajik-Afghan border. With the start of civil war in Tajikistan, refugees began crossing over in massive numbers to Afghan territory. In that situation, at the request of the Tajik leadership, Russia decided to bring border posts to full strength with young reinforcement. In the first days of April, border troops from Russia began to arrive at the Khorog section of the border. They are all volunteers. In accordance with the agreement signed by the heads of states and governments of the Commonwealth, the Tajik-Afghan border was to be guarded by four battalions of the CIS peacemaking forces, coming from Russia, Uzbekistan, Kyrgyzstan, and Belarus, but the decision remained on paper. In reality, only a Kyrgyz blue helmet battalion arrived at the southern frontier of Tajikistan. After staying there for no more than six months, the Kyrgyz servicemen were recalled back home, and left Tajikistan a few weeks ago. The Kyrgyz parliament justified this decision by saying that the republic did not have a law allowing military service on contract. So in the end only border troops from Russia are guarding Tajikistan's southern border.

[Ilyashchenko, addressing Shaposhnikov] After the break-up of the USSR and the great reshaping that started in its wake, many of our soldiers and officers found themselves in the position of enforced emigres. What are the arrangements for the social and legal protection of Russian soldiers and officers within the framework of the CIS?

[Shaposhnikov] I should like to say that, for intance, the Russian Federation has now gained some experience in solving this issue. I can see that the cornerstone in resolving the issue is a legal and legislative basis, and certainly material security. In this matter, Russia has just taken its first steps forward.

[Ilyashchenko, over video of naval ships in port, sailors, street scenes, interior of a squalid house] But Russian soldiers and sailors serving abroad still have as many problems as ever. Take for instance, Russia's naval base in Tallinn. Serving here are 60,000 personnel. Half the officers on some ships would like to leave owing to the hard living and social conditions they are experiencing in Estonia. At present, only Russia is providing food for the Baltic Fleet. As for the food aid that recently arrived at the base from Ukraine, it was only distributed among Ukrainian sailors. Most officers have long stopped going out to town in uniform, since they don't want to hear abusive shouts of "occupiers" or "invaders." Quite often Russian sailors are wantonly arrested by the local police, and forced to spend time in police cells until their innocence or guilt is established. As for the families of Russian servicemen, they are huddled in huts that can hardly be called abodes. But they hang on, fearing that if they do leave for their home country, there they may end up in dug-outs.

[Shaposhnikov] I think that if all the forces that are, as it were, permeated with the understanding of this problem, form a single front and, moreover, dispersed inland, there will be no other conclusion, or way out, or alternative but to unite and to integrate in the economic field and in the field of defense. Believe it or not, even Lenin—I'm reading something about him now—even he did not advocate the Soviet Union. This is Stalin's phrase, as it were. Lenin advocated an association where only defense and foreign policy were common, with the maximum degree of autonomy and independence in all the rest. We have been nailed together with iron nails, packed with that nice slogan: Every nation has a right to self-determination, to the point of secession. However, there were Stalin's bayonets all over the place, as if to say: Just you try that self-determination of yours.

I was the 17th commander of the air force in the history of our country, the USSR. Just imagine: Of my 16 predecessors, 10 were subject to Stalin's repressions. Moreover, six of them were torn to pieces, brutally tortured and shot dead. These included heroes of the USSR, even twice heroes, such as Smushkevich, Loktionov, Rychagov, and so on. Two others were killed in plane crashes, under circumstances that have not been clarified to this day. One died in oblivion, and so on. And another one from the period after the [Second World] War, Air Marshal Novikov, spent nearly 10 years in gaol.

I do not want this regime any more. I don't want it. At the same time I am in favor of a union. I am in favor of unification and integration, but not in the old forms. From the very beginning I have been regarding the Commonwealth as a new interaction, as a new cooperation between our states on a new basis.

Armed Forces Deputy Favors Pooled Military Efforts

LD2404063193 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 0628 GMT 24 Apr 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent]

[Text] Moscow April 24 TASS—Colonel-General B. Pyankov, deputy commander-in-chief of the CIS Armed Forces, sees the "last chance" for maintaining the country's defence capability only in pooling the military efforts of all CIS states.

"In the event of any potential threat, we shall not be able to defend ourselves if acting alone. We have already been weakened to such an extent that even Russia would not be able to do so," the general said in an interview published in ROSSIISKAYA GAZETA on Saturday.

Having expressed confidence that by taking up reductions in the armed forces "politicians made the right estimate of trends and know what they are doing," Pyankov, as a professional military officer, still deemed it necessary to issue a warning about the need to take good care of defences.

Asked whether the Russian federal budget bears the brunt of the strategic defence of the CIS, the general said: "Russia as the largest state is just destined to bear the brunt of defence and there is no way of getting away from this."

ITAR-TASS Carries Press Review for 24 Apr

LD2404100393 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 0942 GMT 24 Apr 93

["Press Review"—ITAR-TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow April 24 TASS - An all-Russia referendum scheduled for this coming Sunday is the principal topic in today's newspapers. Preparatory work has been done most efficiently in Nizhniy Novgorod and Barnaul, Vladimir Shumeyko, first deputy prime minister and deputy chairman of the government commission in charge of the referendumm said in an interview published in ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI newspaper.

At the same time Shumeyko pointed out some things that worry him. He noted that not a single administration chief responded to his request to attend an intercom hook-up council on Thursday although they had attended a similar council held recently by the Supreme Soviet (parliament).

"There are serious misgivings about a voter turnout. Over the years of perestroika and subsequently during the post-perestroika revolution in Russia, people are believed to have begun to get sick and tired of politics and therefore show little interest in it. This is, probably, really so", the Russian parliament newspaper ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA writes in an article about the forthcoming referendum.

ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA points out that, judging by a recent sociological survey, the population of Russia have divided over attitude to the referendum questions. The first question about confidence in Boris Yeltsin is, of course, the key one.

On the strength of an analysis of the survey findings, the newspaper draws a conclusion that "Boris Yeltsin still enjoys a sufficiently tangible prestige and that a large proportion of people will vote for confidence in him".

TRUD newspaper, referring to sociologists' view, notes that "a much greater determination to take part in the polling is observed among the president's opponents than among his supporters".

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA (Red Star) believes that there are grounds for an existing opinion in society that the forthcoming polling will not be able to bring positive or even stabilising results. "Participants in the political struggle have not, unfortunately, bothered to work out and coordinate a procedure for the enactment of the referendum results. Questions are worded in such a way that possible combinations of answers to them may give the broadest scope for every kind of interpretation," KRASNAYA ZVEZDA writes.

A number of newspapers run the basic principles of the presidential draft constitution of Russia. KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA singles out the following firm principles:

- the guarantee of human rights and freedoms.

- the guarantee of the rights of the subjects of the federation on the basis of the Federative Treaty.

- Russia is a presidential democratic republic in which a popularly elected president is the head of state.

- the presidential authority ensures the exercise of consistent parliamentarism and the principle of the separation of powers.

- the constitution ensures an independent and full-fledged judiciary.

- local self-government is the prerogative right of regional authorities.

- the principle of civic patriotism.

- everyone who was born or permanently resides in Russia has the right to Russian citizenship.

ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA carries an interview with Russian Central Bank chief Viktor Gerashchenko. In response to a question as to the reason for his disagreement with the current reforms, he said: "There is one principal reason. I categorically disagree that Russia can do without an economic management by the state."

NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA, commenting on the recent talks between the presidents of Armenia and Azerbaijan, points out that their meeting was an outstanding political event. "Under present-day circumstances, Yerevan has to represent similtaneously two positions—its own and that of Nagorno-Karabakh. But they do not always and not quite coincide," the newspaper notes.

Churkin Outlines New Proposals on Yugoslav Crisis

LD2404223393 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1342 GMT 24 Apr 93

[By ITAR-TASS diplomatic correspondent Georgiy Shmelev]

[Text] Moscow, 24 Apr (ITAR-TASS)—In a conversation today with an ITAR-TASS correspondent, the Russian president's special emissary Vitaliy Churkin said that Russia intends to come up in the near future with a set of new proposals for a political resolution of the Yugoslav crisis. Without going into details on these, he said that a great deal of analytical work is going on at the present time at the Russian Federation Foreign Ministry. In overall terms, the deputy foreign minister commented, the most vigorous diplomatic efforts are now under way to seek a way out of this most complex situation, and Russian diplomacy is among the front-runners in this. Vitaliy Churkin, who is just back from a working trip to Brussels, Paris, and Zagreb, said that while there he had "extremely useful contacts" on settling the Yugoslav crisis with the European Community and with representatives of the new French Administration. Vitaliy Churkin spoke of a "hopeful" conversation he had with Radovan Karadzic, who telephoned him in Paris. Vitaliy Churkin stressed to him that our line remains unchanged in aiming to prompt the Bosnian Serbs to accept the Vance-Owen settlement plan "with a minimum of changes." The diplomat went on to say that particular attention had been devoted to the question of creating "security zones" (along the lines of Srebrenica) in other Muslim enclaves in eastern Bosnia. "I was left with the impression that a positive outcome here is not ruled out," Vitaliy Churkin said. Regarding the fact that the UN Security Council resolution on tougher sanctions against current Yugoslavia comes into force on 26 April, the Russian deputy foreign minister said, "That is the reality. If the Bosnian Serbs were to accept the peace settlement plan that could make a radical change in the situation." Even so, Vitaliy Churkin stressed, "the situation should not be dramatized, although the imposition of sanctions is a grave decision." "Russia is holding on to the hope that the sides will shortly come to some kind of resolution of the problem," he said.

Government To Support Sanctions Against FRY

LD2604085093 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 0734 GMT 26 Apr 93

[By ITAR-TASS diplomatic correspondent Georgiy Shmelev]

[Text] Moscow, 26 Apr—Russia will support sanctions against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, especially in light of reports that the Bosnian Serbs are rejecting even in principle the Vance-Owen plan for a peaceful settlement of the Yugoslav crisis, Russian Federation Foreign Minister Andrey Kozyrev has stated. It seems they have made their choice in support of war, he said. Why should Russia agree to this? We do not intend to tolerate a "war party" even here at home in the CIS, Kozyrev stressed. He was answering a question from an ITAR-TASS correspondent on Sunday [25 April] evening before voting in the referendum in Moscow.

The foreign minister said he felt "sick at heart" over the fact that the Russian side had refrained from voting for the resolution on stepping up sanctions against the FRY. "This decision was probably correct in principle, but in the future we must vote not with the nationalist patriots, but with those who support a civilized solution to issues," he believes.

Kozyrev on 'Unorthodox' Plan To Mediate in Sarajevo

MK2304112493 Moscow SEGODNYA in Russian No. 10, 23 Apr 93 (Signed to Press 22 Apr) p 4

[Sergey Parkhomenko report published in "Idea" column: "'Nothing Terrible: At Worst, We Will Have To Sit Through a Little Bombardment.' Russian Foreign Minister Again Fights Diplomatic Routine"]

[Text] It is not ruled out that Russian Foreign Minister Andrey Kozyrev's propensity toward using not quite traditional and sometimes fairly extravagant means of diplomacy will soon receive a new incarnation. Talking with journalists three days ago in a live program on Ekho Moskvy radio he used the phrase from the headline as part of his latest sensational proposal: To hold another conference on the settlement of the conflict in former Yugoslavia with the participation of the heads of the major European and American foreign affairs agencies directly in Sarajevo or even in the besieged Srebrenica.

"Such ideas do not occur because things are wonderful," Kozyrev continued when the microphones were switched off and SEGODNYA's correspondent asked him to elaborate a little on the essence of his proposal. "But remember how the Yugoslav drama has been unfolding in front of our eyes and that whoever has tried to deal with it has failed. At first the EC assumed responsibility for resolving the conflict. Then the London conference was initiated. Now the UN Security Council is doing it.... Gradually a familiar feeling of utter helplessness arises: Things have long been in total deadlock, there is no way out in sight, and diplomats in many countries are beginning to be tormented by the wish to simply undertake anything at all. And now someone suggests that some inconceivable corps be knocked together and sent to the area of hostilities, and someone is threatening bombardment....

"My idea, too, arose simply from a feeling of frustration. Perhaps we should indeed all go directly to Sarajevo—not at all in order to adopt heroic poses there. Perhaps if we get together in such proximity to the conflict, the people who are pursuing the war there every day, will sooner or later learn about it—at least on the radio—and understand that they are receiving sympathy, that there is concern about their situation, and that indeed efforts are being made to resolve everything."

"Work in a totally extraordinary situation of unprecedented transformations in our country sometimes prompts me to look for some methods that would also be unorthodox," Andrey Kozyrev went on. "And in spite of the fact that I am a career diplomat, brought up on the traditions, on the customs of my profession, it seems necessary for me to break this diplomatic routine from time to time.

"And after the Stockholm speech I, generally speaking, am afraid of nothing...."

Additional Transport Detachment Leaves for Bosnia

LD2504135293 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 1000 GMT 25 Apr 93

[By Tatyana Khudobina; from the "Vesti" newscast]

[Text] A transport detachment of drivers, medics, and coordinators of the Russian State Committee for Emergency Situations set off from Moscow on 20 KAMAZ trucks destined for Belgrade this morning. Since 10 February, a detachment of the State Committee for Emergency Situation has been working on the territory of former Yugoslavia. It is delivering international humanitarian aid to Sarajevo, as well as Tuzla and Srebrnica. The Office of the UN High Commissioner for Refugees, highly assessing the profesionalism of our drivers, has asked for one more detachment to increase the deliveries of humanitarian aid to the suffering population of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

Foreign Ministry Announces Plans To Recognize Macedonia

LD2304211893 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1916 GMT 23 Apr 93

[By ITAR-TASS diplomatic correspondent Georgiy Shmelyov]

[Text] Moscow April 23 TASS—Russia intends to establish diplomatic relations with the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia.

Macedonia's independence was recognized by Moscow back in August, 1992, and it is high time to pass over to the development of full- scale diplomatic relations between the two states. A decision to the effect may be adopted in the immediate future, a source at the Russian Foreign Ministry told ITAR-TASS here today.

The admission of Macedonia to the United Nations in early April will mean its quick and broad international recognition. Belarus, Turkey and a number of other states have established diplomatic relations with Macedonia.

A certain delay is provoked by differences of Athens and Skopje over the name of the new independent state. However, it seems progress has been achieved in this sphere and a mutually acceptable solution will soon be reached.

Yeltsin Warns Latvia About 'Ethnic Cleansing'

LD2304143293 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1353 GMT 23 Apr 93

[Text] Moscow April 23 TASS—Russian President Boris Yeltsin has warned the Latvian authorities the adoption of a resolution "on issuance of temporary residence permit to persons, whose stay in Latvia is caused by temporary dislocation of Russian troops in the Latvian Republic" may "affect the Russian-Latvian relations and the international image of Latvia".

A statement made by the Russian president today says the Latvian parliament started to consider the draft resolution on April 20. The draft may affect the fates of tens of thousands of people, who enjoyed the citizenship of the Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic and resided in Latvia on legitimate grounds. "A base of ethnic cleansing is actually being created in Latvia," says the statement.

Latvian Parliament Actions Seen Dooming Talks

LD2604094393 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 0922 GMT 26 Apr 93

[By ITAR-TASS diplomatic correspondent Sergey Nikishov]

[Text] Moscow April 26 TASS—"Russia believes holding another round of Russo-Latvian talks scheduled between April 26-28 is pointless, since they are doomed to failure by the activities of the Latvian Parliament," Ambassador Sergey Zotov, head of the Russian delegation to the talks with Latvia, said in a statement circulated today.

Zotov's statement came in the wake of plans announced by the Latvian Parliament to adopt a resolution on April 28 "laying a legal foundation for the subsequent deportation of tens of thousands of ethnic Russians."

A draft of the resolution adopted by the Latvian Parliament "brutally infringes on generally acknowledged norms in the sphere of human rights and the commitments Latvia had undertaken when joining the United Nations and the CSCE," Zotov said.

The draft resolution "throws back" talks on the withdrawal of Russian troops from Latvia, whose number has been reduced from 57,000 to 22,000 within a period of one year. "Another anti-Russian action will negatively affect bilateral economic ties and will make it impossible for Russia to put into effect a regime of a most-favoured nation status in trade with Latvia," the ambassador said.

The terms of a new meeting between state delegations of both countries will be settled after studying the results of possible consequences the resolution might entail.

Foreign Ministry Welcomes U.S. 23 Apr Statement

LD2604130093 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1140 GMT 26 Apr 93

[Text] Moscow, 26 Apr (ITAR-TASS)—The Russian Federation Foreign Ministry has circulated a statement today that says:

"The Russian side views the statement made by the U.S. White House on 23 April with great satisfaction.

"This document contains a comprehensive program of practical measures for implementing the historic Vancouver declaration that was agreed in the course of the latest Russian-American summit. Russia and the United States are proceeding from words to specific deeds in implementing the planned program of Russian-American cooperation both in the military-political and trade-economic spheres of bilateral relations on a new basis of partnership.

"For our part, we are ready to ensure support for this positive process in a most effective and energetic way."

'Itogi' Program Covers Link Between U.S. Aid, Reform

LD2504231393

[Editorial Report] Moscow Ostankino Television First Channel Network in Russian at 1700 GMT on 25 April carries in its "Itogi" program a seven-minute item on U.S. aid for Russia. Anchorman Yevgeniy Kiselev says that apart from the referendum, another topic is also linked to the future of the economic reform in Russia. This is the topic of Western aid to the economic transformation of our country. Kiselev stresses that it was this topic which was discussed during this week's television bridge in which Strobe Talbott, special adviser to the U.S. secretary of state on issues of relations with newly independent states, took part. Kiselev says that "many believe that this person is actually the main adviser responsible for formulating U.S. policy on Russia and the CIS countries. Our interview was arranged by the television bridge using the channels of the Worldnet U.S. Television Company."

The Worldnet presenter then announces in English: "Worldnet presents 'Dialogue,' an international televised news conference." The first question asked by Kiselev is what made Mr. Talbott, who is not a professional diplomat but a well-known journalist and author of many books on Russia and the former USSR, take such a a sudden turn in his carrier and to agree to take up his present post. Asked whether his personal relationship with President Clinton, or something else, was the main reason for this, Mr. Talbott answers that his friendship with President Clinton started at the end of the 1960's when they studied at Oxford together. He continues by saying that he visited Russia when he was not yet 20 and "fell in love with the country forever." He says that he "could not resist the temptation to use his knowledge and experience in a new field" when President Clinton offered him a chance to be directly involved in developing U.S. policy on Russia.

Asked how much time President Clinton devotes to problems linked with relations with Russia, Talbott answers: "An extraordinary amount, especially when you consider how many other important problems he faces. Moreover, Clinton became President by promising that if he wins he will devote his main attention to America's internal problems, economic problems. But at the same time he also promised that aid to reforms in Russia will be the main priority of his administration's foreign policy."

Asked whether events which will follow the referendum in Russia can affect the future of U.S. aid, Mr. Talbott says that he "will try to be responsive," but before answering the question he congratulates all citizens of Russia on the day of the referendum. He goes on to say that "naturally we will be keeping a close eye on the results of your referendum. As for aid to Russia, it is important to understand the following point here: It will be granted in different areas, for example, jointly with the Big Seven. This aid will be granted on condition that the Russian Government will pursue a certain economic policy. The most important issue is the issue of inflation, which threatens to simply destroy your country. At present your government intends to fight the inflation, strengthen the ruble, and turn it back into the real currency. But if this policy is suspended, the Big Seven countries, including the United States, may reconsider the aid program to Russia. The second point which I would like to stress is that the lion's share of U.S. aid is given not to governmental structures, but directly to the private sector, nongovernmental and public organizations and therefore, to a large degree it will not depend on changes in the political situation." The video shows Worldnet monitors—one in Washington showing Mr. Talbott and the other one in Moscow showing Kiselev.

Foreign Ministry Welcomes Arab-Israeli Talks

LD2304125793 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1210 GMT 23 Apr 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondents Aleksandr Smelyakov and Sergey Staroselskiy]

[Text] Moscow April 23 TASS—The Russian Federation, which is a co-sponsor of the Middle East peace process, praises the decision of participants in the Arab-Israeli dialogue to resume bilateral talks on April 27 in Washington, Sergey Yastrzhembskiy, director of the Information and Press Department of the Russian Foreign Ministry, said at a briefing today.

Russia is reiterating its firm allegiance to the goal of achieving a comprehensive political settlement in the Middle East on the basis of Resolutions 242 and 338 of the U.N. Security Council and the "peace in exchange for territories" principle recorded in them, as well as on the basis of the exercise of the national rights of the

Palestinian people, including their right to self- determination, the Foreign Ministry spokesman said.

The unconditional rejection of extremism and acts of terrorism would strongly promote the establishment of just and durable peace in that area, he continued. Moscow proceeds from the assumption that Israel will take steps to improve the humanitarian situation on the occupied territories and to settle once and for all the problem of the deportation of Palestinians in accordance with Resolution 799 of the U.N. Security Council, and will not use those practices running counter to the Geneva Convention, Yastrzhembskiy said. "We urge all parties involved in the Arab-Israeli conflict to refrain in the future from any actions, capable of threatening the advance to peace and stability in the region," he said.

The Russian co-sponsor urges participants in the talks to show the constructive approach and realism as best they can, in order to ensure perceptible progress in the working out of an agreement on the settlement problems. "In this connection, the consent of the Palestinians to resume the talks deserves utmost appreciation. We regard it as as a bold decision taken in a difficult situation," he said. Russia, as a co-sponsor, will promote more actively the finding of compromise solutions to controversial problems by the parties concerned and will do all it can to make 1993 a year of a resolute turn of the Middle East from confrontation to peace, Yastrzhembskiy stressed.

Foreign Ministry Aide Comments

LD2604125193 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1201 GMT 26 Apr 93

[By ITAR-TASS diplomatic correspondent Sergey Nikishov]

[Text] Moscow April 26 TASS—Recent statements made by representatives of the sides participating in the talks on the Middle East settlement show that "at last, the gap in the talks should be overcome," an official of the Russian Foreign Ministry told ITAR-TASS on Monday [26 April], commenting on a situation which emerged on the eve of the ninth round of a peace conference on the Middle East settlement which will open in Washington on Tuesday.

Russia's position on this problem was outlined in a statement by the Russian Foreign Ministry, circulated on April 23. According to the Russian diplomat, Russia's position has much in common with the U.S. position outlined in a recent statement by the U.S. Secretary of State Warren Christopher. The Russian Foreign Ministry confirmed Russia's adherence to the political settlement in the Middle East on the basis of U.N. Security Council Resolutions Nos. 242 and 338, proclaiming the principle of "peace in exchange for territories."

The Russian side comes out for exercising the national rights of the Palestine people, including the right to self-determination. A position of principal importance is Russia's invariable support of the tasks of a peace process, formulated at a conference in Madrid. The Russian diplomat stressed that both the United States and Russia proceed from the assumption that Israel "will take concrete measures to improve the humanitarian situation on the occupied territories and reach a final settlement on the problem of deportation."

Speaking about the prospects for the settlement, the Russian diplomat noted that officials of the Russian Foreign Ministry believe that the Israeli Government is prepared in principle to take a number of steps to remove "non-negotiatory factors" which impede the resumption of the talks. In particular, this concerns a problem of deportation and the situation on the occupied territories. In the opinion of the Russian diplomat, there are certain possibilities for making progress in each direction of the negotiatory process.

'Arafat Seeks Yeltsin's Help on Palestinian Issues

LD2304142293 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1405 GMT 23 Apr 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Aleksandr Elistratov]

[Text] Cairo, 23 Apr—Yasir 'Arafat, chairman of the executive committee of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), sent a letter to Russian President Boris Yeltsin today. The "Voice of the Arabs" radio station learned from sources close to the PLO leadership that Y. 'Arafat's personal message concerns "the decision of the Palestinians and the Arab countries to resume bilateral peace talks with the Israeli delegation" which are to start in Washington on 27 April."

The Palestinian leader's letter points out that "it is very important that Russia, as cochairman of the peace process in the Near East, should play the requisite role to ensure that Israel fulfills its obligations regarding the return of the deported Arabs from the occupied territories and with respect to other problems relating to a settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict in the region."

Y. 'Arafat's personal message to Boris Yeltsin was handed to Boris Shchiborin, Russian ambassador to Tunisia.

Ostankino Representative Talks With PLO Official

LD2304195893 Moscow Radio Moscow in Arabic 1500 GMT 22 Apr 93

[Excerpts] Vyacheslav Bragin, head of the Ostankino Radio and Television Network in the Russian Federation, met Mr. Da'ud Baraqat, the Palestinian ambassador in Moscow. The ambassador recently arrived in Russia, and so his meeting with the head of the Ostankino network was particularly significant. [passage omitted]

Mr. Bragin said in his welcoming speech:

[Begin recording] [Bragin in Russian fading to Arabic translation] We know the history of your state and your leaders and the difficulties faced by your people in the history of building an independent state. [passage omitted]

[Baraqat] [passage omitted] We Palestinians are in a state of great change, a change in the mind; a process of reeducation from inflammatory slogans and slogans for the revolution and armed struggle. Today we are sitting around the negotiating table. This was an important and essential stage in the life of the Palestinian people, and also necessary. But today when we sit down with the Israelis, negotiations become an art, and this method is very important for achieving results, not only with the Israeli Government but between the Palestinian people and the Israeli people. [end recording]

The ambassador of the state of Palestine, Mr. Da'ud Baraqat, briefly described the situation in the Middle East and recent events in the region.

[Begin Baraqat recording] Our friends know that the date set for the negotiations was today, 20 April, and that there was a strategic Palestinian decision to continue with the negotiations. But at the same time, we are convinced that it is not only sitting at the negotiating table that is important, but we need to take positive steps to create a positive climate to ensure the success of the negotiations.

The decision by Mr. Rabin, the Israeli prime minister, to deport the 400 Palestinians to the Lebanese borders, was a serious blow to the concept of peace. The information I have, which is [word indistinct] of the convening of the ninth session, is that Israel has shown its willingness to be flexible on some issues. After a long rupture of relations or an absence of visits from the Palestinian side to Syria, president 'Arafat went to Damascus and met with Syrian leader al-'Asad. Frankly, of all the parties to the negotiations, these are the two important parties. If these parties reach an agreement, this will facilitate the peace process greatly. [end recording] [passage omitted]

Mr. Vyacheslav Bragin stressed the Ostankino network's readiness to cover the political questions faced by the Palestinian people more fully and from all angles as well as questions concerning its everyday life, cultural issues, and issues from its ancient history. [passage omitted]

U.S.-DPRK Talks May Ease Tension on Korean Peninsula

SK2504121693 Moscow Radio Moscow in Korean 1000 GMT 24 Apr 93

[By station reporter (Kavayev) from the "Focus on Asia" program]

[Text] U.S. Undersecretary of State for Political Affairs Peter Tarnoff stated while visiting Seoul that the United States has agreed to hold direct talks with the DPRK to discuss the nuclear security issue on the Korean peninsula.

Station reporter (Kavayev) writes: The decision by North Korea to withdraw from the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty [NPT] made the world community ill at ease. The UN Security Council which deliberated this measure urged the International Atomic Energy Agency to continue to hold talks with North Korea.

Pyongyang's position is consistent. Its decision can be changed only when Washington stops threatening the DPRK with the nuclear issue.

According to the DPRK, the only road for nuclear security is to hold direct talks with the United States. Up until now, both sides had held irregular and unofficial negotiations in Beijing.

The United States has changed its position. In talks with President Kim Yong-sam, U.S. Undersecretary of State Tarnoff conveyed that he was appointed as the head of the U.S. delegation in the official talks with North Korea. The talks are expected to take place in late April. It has not been agreed upon on where to hold the talks.

As proclaimed by U.S. Undersecretary of State Tarnoff, the purpose of the talks is to persuade North Korea to remain in the NPT. As reported by the media, Pyongyang will agree to remain in the NPT only under certain conditions. Washington confirmed that the conditions are to stop the U.S.-South Korea Team Spirit military exercise which is held annually; to allow inspection of U.S. military bases in the ROK where its nuclear weapons are deployed, which North Korea is emphasizing; and that Seoul come out from under the U.S. nuclear umbrella and give up its attempt to attack North Korea.

The agenda and the contents of the talks are issues that should be resolved by the participants of the talks themselves. What is important is that direct Pyongyang-Washington talks will take place for the first time since the end of the Korean war.

Reporter (Kavayev) concludes that the process of easing tensions on the Korean peninsula can be a new incentive.

Paper Reports Japan To Adopt 'Soft Stand' on Kuril Issue

LD2404120193 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1131 GMT 24 Apr 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Vyacheslav Bantin]

[Text] Tokyo April 24 TASS—Japanese Prime Minister Kiichi Miyazawa intends to adopt a soft stand on the Kuril Island problem at talks with Russian President Boris Yeltsin during the latter's proposed visit to Japan in May. This is testified in a report published by the Japanese newspaper "MAINICHI" today which throws light on a hitherto unknown episode which occurred in

Washington during talks between U.S. President Bill Clinton and Japanese Premier Kiichi Miyazawa last week.

According to the newspaper, which quotes its "numerous sources in the government circles of Japan and the United States, during talks with the American President the head of the Japanese Cabinet of Ministers said that at the proposed talks with Russian President Boris Yeltsin he would not go deep into the problem of the "northern territories". [quotation marks as received]

Clarifying his view, Kiichi Miyazawa noted that he considers it necessary to show caution so as not to go too far into discussions on the territorial issue. According to him, such an approach seems sensible in the interest of Boris Yeltsin's visit becoming a good beginning in the construction of friendly Russo-Japanese relations.

The Japanese prime minister also told the U.S. President about Tokyo's aspirations to issue a joint Russo-Japanese communique at the conclusion of Yeltsin's proposed visit and include into this document a common assessment of the possibilities of the develoment of relations between Tokyo and Moscow in the long-term perspective.

Japan Offers Help for Defense Industry Conversion

LD2504084893 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 0741 GMT 25 Apr 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Vladimir Solntsev]

[Text] Tokyo April 25 TASS—Japan seeks to render active assistance to Russia in the establishment of exemplary enterprises in such fields as defence industry conversion to civilian uses and the development of a network of small and medium-sized companies that could become an example to be followed by other Russian businessmen, Yoshiro Mori, Japanese minister of international trade and industry, said here on Sunday during a meeting with Andrey Shapovalians, first deputy minister of economics, who is heading a Russian delegation attending the current East-West conference of the ministers of economics, industry and trade here.

The Japanese minister voiced concern over the expansion of the export of arms by Russia. However, the Russian side pointed out that the scope of arms export does not increase and does not compare, say, with the export of arms by the United States. The minimum export of arms is essential to prevent a wave of bankruptcies of defence sector enterprises while currency revenue earned by them serves, in particular, as a source of funds for defence-sector conversion, the Russian side maintains.

According to Russian delegation members, 14 specific areas have been determined for converting defence plants to the output of civilian products, including the construction of non-military aircraft and ships, the manufacture of electronic equipment and farm machinery, and the production of food and consumer goods.

Deputy Foreign Minister Discusses Role in UN

LD2504172493 Moscow Ostankino Television First Channel Network in Russian 1350 GMT 25 Apr 93

[Studio interview with Deputy Foreign Minister Sergey Lavrov by Vladimir Sukhoy; from the "Panorama" program; date not given—recorded]

[Text] [Sukhoy] Sergey Viktorovich, as deputy Russian foreign minister you are responsible for the area customarily referred to as the UN department. Could you share with us your impressions of what has happened in the United Nations recently and how Russia's role in that international organization has changed?

[Lavrov] Our contribution is twofold. One is passive, simply because the very nature of these geopolitical changes has led to a sharp increase in the number of UN members and to a change in the UN's agenda, primarily in terms of the dramatic increase in its peacekeeping activities. Russia's active contribution lies in our efforts to put forward initiatives of our own on the principles and methods for implementing a reform of the United Nations, which will fit it to cope with the new realities. What we seek from the United Nations is political support for the part which Russia, along with its neighbors, is playing in efforts to quell and overcome conflicts on the territory of the former USSR—all the countries that have emerged on that territory bear responsibility for ensuring that we have the stability and order necessary to enable states and their citizens to exist under normal conditions, and we assume that all our neighbors in the former Soviet Union share the same sense of responsibility.

Let me also mention briefly that there clearly ought also to be financial support from the international community, because by performing peacekeeping functions on the territory of the former USSR, Russia, along with its neighbors, is making a contribution toward strengthening regional and global peace and security.

[Sukhoy] One can come across claims in some sections of the media that Russia is continually losing ground in the United Nations. The fact that Vladimir Fedorovich Petrovskiy, who used to be Butrus-Ghali's deputy, has been moved to work in Geneva, the allegation that Russian will cease to be an official UN language, and our loss of key posts among the permanent positions at the United Nations, and so on, are cited as confirmation of these claims. What do you feel about this?

[Lavrov] Let me take those questions in order. First, as far as Vladimir Fedorovich Petrovskiy is concerned, of course, it can be said that we are no longer represented at the highest level at United Nations headquarters, and I will return to this point in a moment. But it can also be said that it is the first time that a representative of our country has obtained the main UN post in Europe: director of the UN's Geneva office, with the rank of under secretary general, is a key position. He is also in charge of the UN Center for Human Rights, which is a very important subject for us at present.

Undoubtedly, the problem of our representation at UN headquarters remains, and you are right to say that with regard to senior posts—directorships, as they are called at the UN, which are below under secretary general level—the overall number of such posts is declining, by comparison with what the Soviet Union used to have.

As for the Russian language, the final aspect of your question, there has indeed been such talk, which began sometime last autumn. It reached us largely in the form of rumors—we received no official notification of any kind. But the question was too serious for us not to pay attention to those rumors, so we approached the leadership of all the UN's international organizations and specialized agencies and all the member countries through our ambassadors and permanent representatives at those organizations and put forward our position, which is that Russian is one of the official UN languages. I can assure you that there can be no retreat from this position, and I do not think there is any serious foundation to these rumors.

Referendum Issues

Official Activity Before Referendum Reported

Yeltsin Reads Message to Sverdlovsk

LD2304194193 Moscow Ostankino Television First Channel Network in Russian 1844 GMT 23 Apr 93

["Message to the people of Sverdlovsk Oblast," read by President Boris Yeltsin; from the "Vzglyad" program—recorded]

[Video shows Yeltsin seated at desk with Russian flag in background; caption reads "Message to the People of Sverdlovsk Oblast"]

[Text] In a few days time we are to take part in the referendum. Despite the four questions which have been put forward for voting, it is nevertheless devoted to one main question. Whether the transformations in Russia will be continued, whether results which are tangible for every family, for every region will be obtained at last, or whether everything which we suffered for last year will be discarded and whether Russia will turn back, without having noticed that the turning point is already close depends on its results.

There is yet another point to the referendum: It will determine whom the citizens of Russia are with today—with the president, the government, deputies who support the course of reform, the strengthening of stability and order, or with the majority of the Congress who have done everything to stop the transformations.

I believe that this time, as always, you will be able to see things clearly, will be able to resist that invisible torrent of demagogy, as always, and of outright lies which are aimed simply at confusing people. I am sure that you will be able to determine what and who should be believed, all the more so since the people of the Urals have a feeling for truth. I hope that it won't let you down this time, either. I wish you all the very best.

Yeltsin Addresses Nation

CM2604115393 Moscow Ostankino Television First Channel Network in Russian 1735 GMT 24 Apr 93

[Address to the nation by President Boris Yeltsin on the upcoming 25 April referendum; place and date of address not given—recorded]

[Text] Dear people of Russia:

I turn to you on the eve of an event that may be a turning point in the destiny of each one of us and in the destiny of our country.

On Sunday, 25 April, we are to make a decisive choice. Let us remember that success at the referendum means:

—a peaceful solution to the present crisis of power;

—the breaching of the powerful dam erected by the opponents of the transformations in Russia;

—our peaceful breakthrough to the future.

I hope very much that that is what will happen.

Do not believe those who say the reforms have misfired, that these reforms are directed against the people!

Do not believe the "sweet-voiced singers" of the so-called "soft version of reforms." Now, you and I realize full well that there are no simple and painless ways of emerging from the crisis. The drop in living standards is the price of emerging from the impasse into which we were heading for many decades.

But we have passed the most painful, the shock, period already. It is time to go over to calm reform work, without any shocks and fuss.

But in order to carry it out, let us say in the referendum: do not disturb us; do not distract us from the work; do not draw us into senseless political games. We are engaged in serious matters; we do not have the time.

Recently, I have had quite a few meetings with people of different ages and professions, of different social status, convictions, and beliefs. I have visited several regions of Russia. Once again, I have become convinced of the following:

The history, culture, and traditions of Russia and of all the peoples inhabiting it are dear to all of us equally.

We are equally concerned about the future of our Russia and that of our children and grandchildren.

You and I are worried by the same problems.

We want peace, calm, and prosperity for ourselves and for our families and children.

We have ceased to bow down before ideological dogmas; we want to respect ourselves and to take pride in our motherland.

We want to live in a wealthy country, which is capable of providing help to all its citizens who need it.

We have already embarked upon the road to that new Russia.

Dear fellow citizens! My opportunity of implementing the reform policy will depend entirely on how you vote on 25 April. It is your choice that will determine what the president can or cannot do and what the Congress can or cannot do. Therefore, out of the four questions that were proposed, I consider the following ones to be the main questions: the first one—on confidence in the president—and the fourth one—on preterm election of deputies. Whatever the results of the referendum might be, I will act in accordance with the principle of constitutionality, relying on the people's will. We have much work ahead of us.

The whole system of state government is in need of radical reform. We must see to it that no single state body or single leader of even the highest rank can ever again concentrate in their hands the absolute totality of power.

Otherwise the specter of dictatorship will continue to hover over Russia.

Radical transformations of the bodies of representative or legislative power are long overdue.

Russia and its inhabitants have no need of a thousand-member Congress, which meets whenever and as often as it wishes and is entitled to tackle all issues. We have no need of cumbersome soviets in towns and regions. After all, there are often more deputies in them than in the parliaments of other countries.

The country needs an authoritative and professional bicameral parliament, as well as compact and capable bodies of local self-government. Without this, Russia will have no efficient and stable laws, and no order.

If the majority of people demand early elections for people's deputies, I will do everything to hold them this autumn—no later than that.

The whole system of executive power—i.e., president-Russian Government-republican governments-local administrations—ought to be brought into line with present requirements. The main thing is to free them from trivial tutelage, from constant arm-grabbing on the part of soviets, both at the federal and local level.

I believe our country should and will be a presidential republic.

All three branches of power—representative, executive, and independent and effective judicial—should be reliable guarantors of the rights and freedoms of citizens; serve as a reliable defense against encroachments upon their life, health, worth, and material well-being.

The referendum is our chance to strengthen our state in a peaceful and legal way.

Without that, the embezzlement of public funds, corruption, cannot be halted, bureaucratic excesses cannot be stopped, crime cannot be curbed.

The platform that I am taking with me to the referendum includes the draft of the new constitution of the Russian Federation.

You know a great deal of work has been carried out in recent years on the new constitution. Several versions have been prepared, including one by A.D. Sakharov. Each of them contain quite a few strong ideas that literally break new ground.

At my request, a group of very eminent lawyers prepared a draft constitution that incorporates the best of what has already been accomplished.

The Russian constitution will generalize what has been elaborated by the Russian tradition of state construction. It will organically incorporate the Federation Treaty now in force.

In the very near future, the draft constitution will be sent to the Federation's subjects for their consideration.

Your votes for the president will be regarded also as your desire to adopt the new constitution.

After the referendum one of the main areas of work will be measures to curb the growth of crime in the country.

It must be said bluntly: raging crime is directly linked to political instability. The weaker authority is, the more impudent the criminals are.

The strengthening of legality and of law and order in Russia will naturally follow from constitutional reform and from the strengthening of Russian statehood.

The main task in the economy is to consolidate to the maximum on the first signs of stabilization. For this it is necessary first and foremost to support the trend toward reduction in inflation. I am preparing and will sign in the near future a decree "On the bearings of monetary and credit policy in Russia for 1993." It will contain the necessary important anti-inflationary measures.

We will comprehensively strengthen guarantees of rights of owners in the Russian Federation. A number of decrees will be adopted in the near future regulating our economic and financial relations with our CIS partners. Favoring the development of economic ties with our partners, we nevertheless want Russia's economic interests to be safely protected.

The restructuring of the national economy is impossible without some unviable enterprises going bankrupt. But this must not affect people or their staff. The bankruptcy in this country will mean the state will have a special tutelage over enterprises. A decree "On the setting up of the central interdepartmental commission to improve and reorganize state enterprises" is being drawn up for this purpose. I have named far from everything. If we carry out everything that we have planned, reform will begin to bear real fruit for the citizens of Russia.

Everything that is done today is being done for the future. The future belongs to young people. I know that young people who have tasted freedom will never give it back. I appeal to people of my generation and all parents to attend polling stations and vote for the future of their children.

I will do everything necessary to restore an attitude of respect for the Armed Forces and the officer corps. That process is already under way. The wave of attacks on the Armed Forces is subsiding. The Army is not only the defender of but also one of the symbols of the new Russia. It represents one of the main bulwarks of stability and calm. I have signed a decree taking us back to a tradition of ours. From now on officers who have served their term with dignity will on retirement receive an allotment of land that they can farm or will be entitled to sell. We are beginning the reform of the Army, which will lend Army service greater prestige and make it more lucrative.

Younger and middle-aged people take more easily to the opportunities offered by freedom and the market. Older people find it harder to adapt. It is for this reason that, in pressing forward with our social policy, we will orient it first and foremost toward support for the elderly and the infirm. We have just about doubled the minimum pension.

It has become greater than the minimum wage.

But man cannot live by bread alone.

We have to and will treat with respect those of our mothers and fathers who believed in the past ideals. We had a hard history, but it was the history of our country, our history. We cannot turn away from it.

In addition to Russians' anxieties about their daily bread, about the future of the young democracy, there is also anxiety about the integrity of our state.

In the people of Russia there are no separatist feelings, no mutual differences or hatred. That is the best basis for turning Russia into a strong, free federation.

The first step on this road has been taken—the Federation Treaty has been signed. A great deal of work on implementing it lies ahead. We have to exert considerable efforts to revive the provinces in the Russian Federation. It was always the provinces that made Russia strong. But our main concern is to preserve peace. Surely we do not want war with fraternal republics, with our closest neighbors?! Surely we do not want to wage war with Ukrainians, Belarusians, Kazakhs, and other peoples, or send our sons to such a war?! Surely we do not want the whole world to despise us and fear us again?! I am sure not—no, no, and again no!

Dear compatriots! I believe the referendum will show we are worthy of a new democratic Russia, that we are acquiring the lofty rank of free and responsible people.

At the referendum, every vote will count. If you stay at home, other people will make a decision for you. It may not be the one you would like. If you stay at home, the danger of shuffling and fraud will increase. I urge every Russian citizen to answer by himself the referendum questions and, by one's activity and by one's voting, to make this referendum an honest one. I have been defending your right to define for yourselves the paths along which our state will develop in the future. Now, dear citizens of Russia, it is up to you! I believe in your common sense! I hope for your support! We are together!

Yeltsin Order on Referendum in Armed Forces

PM2604095593 Moscow ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI in Russian 24 Apr 93 p 1

[Directive No. 279-rp of the Russian Federation president "On Ensuring the Constitutional Right of Russian Federation Citizens on Military Service To Take Part in the Referendum," signed by Russian Federation President B. Yeltsin and dated 23 April 1993]

[Text] In connection with the need to ensure the constitutional right of Russian Federation citizens serving in troop units of the Russian Federation Armed Forces, including those outside the Russian Federation, to directly participate in managing the affairs of society and state:

1. The Russian Federation defense minister, the Russian Federation minister of internal affairs, and the Russian Federation security minister shall:

take the requisite steps to ensure the participation in the referendum of Russian Federation citizens serving in military units of the Russian Federation Armed Forces, including those outside the Russian Federation;

rigorously abide by the demands of the Russian Federation Constitution and the RSFSR law "On the RSFSR Referendum" when implementing organizational measures to ensure the participation in the All-Russia referendum of the above categories of Russian Federation citizens.

2. The Russian Federation Council of Ministers-Government shall supervise the implementation of this directive.

3. This directive enters into force the moment it is signed.

[Signed] Russian Federation President B. Yeltsin
[Dated] 22 April 1993

Court Rules on Vote Counting

PM2304100193 Moscow ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI in Russian 23 Apr 93 p 1

[Decree No. 8 of the Russian Federation Constitutional Court "On the Evaluation of the Constitutionality of the Second Part of Point 2 of the Congress of Russian Federation People's Deputies 29 March 1993 Decree 'On the 25 April 1993 All-Russian Referendum, the Procedure for Counting the Votes, and the Mechanism for Implementing the Results of the Referendum,'" dated 21 April 1993, Moscow and signed by V.D. Zorkin, chairman of the Russian Federation Constitutional Court, and Yu.D. Rudkin, secretary of the Russian Federation Constitutional Court]

[Text] The Russian Federation Constitutional Court, comprising Chairman V.D. Zorkin, Deputy Chairman N.V. Vitruk, Secretary Yu.D. Rudkin, and Judges E.M. Ametistov, N.T. Vedernikov, G.A. Gadzhiyev, A.L.

Kononov, V.O. Luchin, T.G. Morshchakova, V.I. Oleynik, N.V. Seleznev, O.I. Tiunov, and B.S. Ebzeyev,

having considered in open session the matter of evaluating the constitutionality of the second part of Point 2 of the Congress of Russian Federation People's Deputies 29 March 1993 Decree No. 4684-1 "On the 25 April 1993 All-Russian Referendum, the Procedure for Counting the Votes, and the Mechanism for Implementing the Results of the Referendum,"

guided by the first part of Article 165 and by Article 165/1 of the Russian Federation Constitution, by Point 1 of the second part and by the fourth part of Article 1, by the fourth part of Article 6, by Article 32, by Point 2 of the first part and by the second part of Article 57, by Point 1 of the first part of Article 58, and by Article 64 of the Law on the Russian Federation Constitutional Court,

has decreed that:

1. The second part of Point 2 of the Congress of Russian Federation People's Deputies 29 March 1993 Decree No. 4684-1 "On the 25 April 1993 All-Russian Referendum, the Procedure for Counting the Votes, and the Mechanism for Implementing the Results of the Referendum," referring to the counting of the referendum votes on the following questions presented in it: "Do you have confidence in Russian Federation President B.N. Yeltsin?" and "Do you approve the socioeconomic policy the Russian Federation president and Russian Federation government have been implementing since 1992?" is deemed to conflict, in terms of its content, with the Russian Federation Constitution, its Article 4, and also Article 5, concretized in the 16 October 1990 Russian Federation Law "On an RSFSR Referendum."

2. The second part of Point 2 of the Congress of Russian Federation People's Deputies 29 March 1993 Decree No. 4684-1 "On the 25 April 1993 All-Russian Referendum, the Procedure for Counting the Votes, and the Mechanism for Implementing the Results of the Referendum," referring to the counting of referendum votes on the following questions presented in it: "Do you consider it necessary to have an early election for the Russian Federation president?" and "Do you consider it necessary to have early elections for Russian Federation people's deputies?" is deemed to conform to the Russian Federation Constitution.

3. In accordance with the second part of Article 65 of the Law on the Russian Federation Constitutional Court, the provision of the Congress of Russian Federation People's Deputies 29 March 1993 Decree No. 4684-1 thus ruled unconstitutional and all normative acts based on it or reproducing it and their individual provisions are deemed invalid.

4. In accordance with Articles 49 and 50 of the Law on the Russian Federation Constitutional Court, this decree enters into effect immediately after it is published and is final and not subject to appeal.

5. In accordance with the first part of Article 84 of the Law on the Russian Federation Constitutional Court, this decree is to be published in VEDOMOSTI SEZDA NARODNYKH DEPUTATOV ROSSIYSKOY FEDERATSII I VERKHOVNOGO SOVETA ROSSIYSKOY FEDERATSII no later than seven days after it is set forth. The decree must also be published in ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA and all other publications which published the Congress of Russian Federation People's Deputies 29 March 1993 Decree No. 4684-1 "On the 25 April 1993 All-Russian Referendum, the Procedure for Counting the Votes, and the Mechanism for Implementing the Results of the Referendum."

[Signed] V.D. Zorkin, chairman of the Russian Federation Constitutional Court, and Yu.D. Rudkin, secretary of the Russian Federation Constitutional Court

Khasbulatov on Court Decision

LD2304215593 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 1900 GMT 23 Apr 93

[By correspondent T. Aldoshina; from the "Vesti" newscast]

[Text] Ruslan Khasbulatov today met representatives of the intelligentsia. Moreover, according to one of the speakers, it was not the stateless intelligentsia with whom Boris Yeltsin had been meeting, but those who have inherited the spirit and morality of Russian traditions. Let us note the fact that present in the hall were such well known figures as Bondarev, Burlyayev, and Limonov, as well as the editors of the newspapers DEN and SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA.

It was probably for this reason that applause greeted Ruslan Khasbulatov's statement, that in solving the nationalities question in Russia, it is first and foremost necessary to solve the Russian question.

The chairman of the Supreme Soviet noted that all meetings are at present being appraised from the viewpoint of the upcoming referendum. He stated that the decision of the Constitutional Court on the counting of votes in the referendum was unexpected, and complained that there is not always an opportunity to influence events.

Khasbulatov said once again that the main brake on reforms is the reformers themselves, but stressed that the legislators do have one weapon—the law and the Constitution.

Kozyrev on Ties With International Community

LD2604110893 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1040 GMT 26 Apr 93

[By ITAR-TASS diplomatic correspondent Georgiy Shmelev]

[Text] Moscow April 26 TASS - "Relations with the international community will improve in all respects," Russian Foreign Minister Andrey Kozyrev said in anticipation of referendum results on Sunday [25 April] evening before going to vote in Moscow.

"There will be no concessions to the opposition," he said, replying to ITAR-TASS. Opposition forces try to drive a wedge between Moscow and its international partners and allies as well as in the Commonwealth of Independent States.

Their efforts are spearheaded at undermining Russia's positions in the world arena and then declaring: "You see, democrats can do nothing at the international scale either," he added.

"It is impossible to fool the Russian people. I'm sure that Russians will vote for common sense, for democratic reforms and for a civilised road of Russia's development," Kozyrev said.

The main thing is to prevent "various types of neobolsheviks and red-brown renegades from stealing" the victory won by democratic forces, he added.

The present referendum is the third popular voting. Evidently, it is necessary to say enough and to use power to establish law and order as well as to strengthen stability.

"Small doubt, Boris Yeltsin will do precisely this," the minister noted. "Therefore, I vote for the Russian president."

Voting Begins for 25 April Referendum

Yeltsin Votes at 0800

LD2504082493 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 0700 GMT 25 Apr 93

[Text] President Yeltsin cast his vote in Moscow today at the former House of Pioneers on Aleksandr Nevskiy at about 0800 [0400 GMT]. According to the news agencies, the president did not make any statements at the time. He merely joked that on the question of confidence in the president his wife would probably answer no.

Early Appearance 'Unexpected'

LD2504072093 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 0648 GMT 25 Apr 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Gennadiy Talalayev]

[Text] Moscow, 25 Apr—Russian President Boris Yeltsin was one of the first to vote today at the referendum, arriving with his wife at polling station no. 11 on Aleksandr Nevskiy Street in Moscow 45 minutes after it opened. As an ITAR-TASS correspondent was informed by Olga Khomyakova, secretary of the polling station committee, Boris Yeltsin, having received his ballots, asked his wife how she would vote on the first question—on confidence in the president. Referring to the clause on secret voting she replied that "she will think about it in the polling booth."

At 1000 [0600 GMT] at the polling station where the president voted, of the 2,120 people on the electorate roll, 247 had voted. Such an early appearance by the president at the polling station was completely unexpected for a considerable number of Russian and foreign correspondents who did not expect him until 1000.

Violations Reported

LD2504084693

[Editorial Report] Moscow Mayak Radio Network in Russian at 0713 GMT on 25 April carries a report by Mayak radio correspondent Olga Vasilenko from the Public Committee for Supporting the President [Obshchestvennyy Komitet Po Poderzhki Prezidenta] on voting figures from the Russian Federation referendum so far.

She reports that it has received information from Archangelsk that foreign observers, including some from the United States, were only allowed into polling stations after "very long and difficult talks with the administration." She says that an additional question has to be answered by the people of this oblast: "Do you agree that the streets, squares, and rayons of Archangelsk oblast should not be renamed any further?"

She also says that reports have come in from Tambov oblast on violations in the voting procedures.

Vasilenko adds that a report has come in from Murmansk that the chairman of one voting commission turned up at the polling station drunk, "so just imagine what sort of mood the voters there are in when the authority represented by the referendum is in such a state."

She continues: "A very alarming signal has come in from Belgorod oblast. In some constituencies, the electorate itself has simply stopped voting because every ballot paper had to carry either of two signatures—either of members of the commission or a seal. Evidently people decided that the seal should be an impressive round one with an emblem but instead of that, there is simply a stamp mark—which incidentally is allowed. People distrust the authorities so much that the electorate decided to seek the truth and stopped voting until the matter is cleared up."

Vasilenko gives some of the latest voting figures: "In the Koryak Autonomous Okrug, by 0100 GMT, naturally, 68.5 percent of the electorate had voted. What else? In the Jewish autonomous oblast, as of 0500 GMT, 51 percent of the electorate had voted. In the Chuvash republic, at 0800 local time, 6.36 percent of the electorate was at the polling stations. In Vologda oblast, by 0700, 1,096 voters had voted. Well, there is no particularly clear picture yet. I do not have any information about Moscow."

Vasilenko promises further reports on the voting as it becomes available.

Exit Polls Show Confidence in Yeltsin

LD2504181993

[Editorial report] Moscow Ostankino Television First Channel Network in Russian at 1743 GMT on 25 April on the "Itogi" newscast broadcasts a 4-minute report on the results of the referendum based on an exit poll.

With only 17 minutes to go before the polls close, "Itogi" announcer Yevgeniy Kiselev gives the results of a Public Opinion Foundation exit poll of 2,400 people carried out in 16 Russian towns throughout Russia today. As of 1800 hours Moscow time [1400 GMT]:

Question 1. 75 percent had confidence in the president, 24 percent—no confidence.

2. 67 percent for socioeconomic reforms; 32 percent against.

3. 29 percent for presidential elections; 68 percent against.

4. 78 percent for parliamentary elections; 20 percent against.

Confusion Reported in Khabarovsk Kray

OW2504122093

[Editorial Report] Khabarovsk Radio Khabarovsk Network in Russian at 0829 GMT on 25 April carries a 31-minute special "Kray News" program jointly presented by Ludmila Rumyantsova and Valeriy Yeremin. It features an interview by telephone with Ivan Ivanovich Kandaurov, a member of the Khabarovsk Kray district electoral commission, progress reports from correspondents on voter turnout in rayon electoral districts, and interviews with citizens on their voting intentions.

Kandaurov provides figures for voter turnout throughout the kray, saying that by 1000 hours local time [2300 GMT 24 April] 14.6 percent of eligible electors had voted. By 1500 hours local time [0400 GMT] the figure stood at 45.5 percent.

Within the latest turnout figures, he says the most active city voting points are Khabarovsk, Komsomolsk-Na-Amure; he cites turnout figures for Sovetskaya Gavan, where 52.2 percent have voted, and Nikolayevsk-Na-Amure where the figure was 47.6 percent.

He says other commission turnout figures are as follows: Bikinskiy Rayon 49.9 percent, Ayano-Mayskiy Rayon 80.5 percent, Vaninskiy Rayon 50 percent, and Vyazemskiy and Polina Osipenko Rayons 62 percent each.

He says that polls will close at 2200 local time [1100 GMT] and, "In the remaining two hours we will have a good showing, and that will give us the right to say that the referendum on all the issues has been completed in Khabarovsk Kray."

Kandaurov also reports that despite timely briefing and dissemination of instructions on voting procedure by the district electoral commission, wrong information given to voters by central television and radio has prompted many phone calls from polling centers on whether voting dockets needed to be signed or stamped.

Rumyantsova then takes calls from correspondents reporting on voter turnout around the kray. One says that of 40,356 registered voters in Lazo Rayon, 20,506, or 49 percent of total have so far voted, but provides no timing for the count. Other correspondents report that by 1500 hours local time [0400 GMT], 52 percent of electors in Vyazemskiy Rayon had voted and the figure in Amursk Rayon, was 36 percent by 1400 hours local time [0300 GMT].

Another correspondent reports on voter turnout in the northern regions of the kray. In Okhotsk Rayon, 52 percent of registered voters had voted by 1300 hours local time [0200 GMT] and in Polina Osipenko Rayon the figure was 46 percent by 1300 hours local time [0200 GMT].

In another report from Vaninskiy Rayon, which has 33,000 registered voters, a correspondent reports that voting in almost inaccessible places was being carried out by helicopter and that there is only one location (Domopavlovo) where residents were forced to vote by radio.

Then follow interviews with citizens from undisclosed locations on their voting intentions

Rumyantsova says final results are expected to be known by 1-2 May.

The special "Kray News" program ends at 0900 GMT.

No further processing planned.

'No Complications' in Vladivostok

LD2504130993 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 1000 GMT 25 Apr 93

[By correspondent M. Voznesenskiy from Vladivostok; from the "Vesti" newscast]

[Excerpts] No rallies, no attempts at propaganda, and no obvious law violations. The referendum in Vladivostok has no complications except the confusion caused by yesterday's slip of the tongue on television by chairman of the Central Electoral Commission Kazakov. [passge omitted]

Mainly middle-aged and elderly people have come to decide Russia's future. There are few young people at polling stations. According to information received by 0500 GMT. Approximately 43.5 percent of those on the lists had voted. The fact that the referendum in Maritime Kray will be regarded as valid gives hope.

North Ossetians Voting

LD2504125793 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1204 GMT 25 Apr 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Valeriy Shanayev]

[Text] Vladikavkaz, 25 Apr—Aguba Kuchiyev, chairman of the North Ossetian central electoral commission, said that voting is proceeding as normal in all 325 republican electoral districts. It is remarkable that electors from areas where curfew is in force are the most active ones. On the whole throughout the republic over 44 percent of electors have already voted by 1300 [0900 GMT].

The voting is proceeding without any excesses. Of course, there are certain problems at a number of polling stations: misspelled names of electors and the lack of clear communications, but people are actively expressing their attitude to the fate of Russia in this difficult moment in its history. On the whole the referendum is proceeding calmly in the state of emergency zone, Major General Aleksandr Khodov, secretary of the Security Council of North Ossetia, told an ITAR-TASS correspondent. No exchanges of fire or armed clashes caused by ethnic reasons have been registered in the last 24 hours in the region.

Prisoners Voting in Favor of 'Freedom'

LD2504194193 Moscow Ostankino Television First Channel Network in Russian 1700 GMT 25 Apr 93

[By unidentified correspondent; from the "Itogi" newscast]

[Text] Voting got under way this morning in perhaps Russia's most famous prison, the Moscow Butyrka. Those who have been remanded into custody have voted. Unlike those prisoners who have already been sentenced, they are entitled to take part in the referendum. The prison's very own electoral commission was set up here, headed by the deputy chief of this remand block, and 11 polling booths have been set up in especially reserved places—in general, everything that normal people have, so to speak.

It has to be said that the turnout by the local inhabitants was extremely high—out of the 4,500 of those entitled to vote, nearly all dropped their ballots into the ballot box.

[Begin recording] [Correspondent] What have you voted for, guys?

[Unidentified prisoner] For what? Why, freedom, of course!

[Correspondent] What do you think—which of the current political leaders will be able to put the country back in order?

[Prisoner] It is obvious. He can, of course—he got us into this mess, let him get us out again—why should anyone else have to?

[Second prisoner] Let's have someone who can see something through to the end. [end recording]

Russian Citizens Vote Outside of Federation

Voting in Tallinn 'Organized'

LD2504100793 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1001 GMT 25 Apr 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Albert Maloveryan]

[Text] Tallinn April 25 TASS—Four polling stations opened here on Sunday morning [25 April] for 32,000 Russian Federation citizens, who live in Estonia, to be able to take part in the referendum. Three polling stations have been set up in the Russian Embassy compound here and another one, in agreement with the Estonian Government, is functioning in Narva, one of major centres in the republic's north-east, where a large proportion of the Russian-speaking population, including those who have been granted Russian citizenship, live as a community.

The polling stations will remain open until eight p.m. local time to enable citizens of Russia, who permanently reside here or who have arrived here on business, as well as servicemen from among Russian Armed Forces stationed in Estonia and members of their families, to take part in the referendum.

Citizens Vote in Baltics

LD2504193093 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1905 GMT 25 Apr 93

[By ITAR-TASS]

[Text] Moscow April 25 TASS—Due to the referendum, Russian citizens living in Latvia and servicemen could realise that they number tens of thousands. Hundreds of people were queueing at the polling station in Riga by midday. Two more polling stations were open this Sunday [25 April] in Liepaja and Daugavpils.

Servicemen voted in localities where their units are stationed as Latvian laws limit travel of Russian servicemen.

Hundreds of people, bearers of passports of the USSR, but without Russian citizenship registered, gathered at the Russian Consulate in Riga to demand that they be allowed to vote. But this is not stipulated by law.

Some five thousand Russians went to three polling stations opened at the Russian Embassy in Estonia. The voter turnout was quite large, and photo reporters photographed lines at the entrance to the embassy.

Several days ago, residents of Narva were concerned if the Estonian authorities permit them to vote. The Estonian Foreign Ministry has made a decision permitting all residents of Narva and of all cities of the Russian-speaking region to vote in the referendum without crossing the border into Russia.

Nevertheless many Russians residing in Narva—invalids and the aged—could not vote as Russian diplomats failed to reach agreement with the Estonian authorities on enabling people to cast ballots at home.

Russians Vote Throughout CIS

LD2504193393 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1906 GMT 25 Apr 93

[By unidentified ITAR-TASS correspondents]

[Text] Moscow April 25 TASS—The voting in the Russian referendum has been organized this Sunday [25 April] also outside the limits of Russia, in countries of the Commonwealth of Independent States.

Russian diplomats and servicemen, as well as construction workers at the quake site voted in Yerevan. The Russian Embassy made an announcement over the radio on the eve of the referendum that all Russians staying in Armenia can vote.

There was bustle in the Russian Embassy in Moldova. People with the stamps about Russian citizenship in their passports were able to make a decision about their future.

There was a large voter turnout at the referendum in the Russian Embassy in Turkmenistan, said Yevgeniy Belov, chairman of the election commission. About 50 per cent of Russian voters cast their ballots in Ashgabat by midday, he told ITAR-TASS.

Voting was held at only one place in Ukraine, the Russian Embassy in Kiev. Many people travelled from various Ukrainian cities in order to vote—from Poltava, the Donetsk basin, from various regions. But so far only 300 Russians voted at the polling station at the embassy.

Conflicting Views on 'Irregularities' Reported

LD2504095693

[Editorial Report] Moscow Mayak Radio Network in Russian at 0845 GMT on 25 April carries a report by Mayak correspondent Olga Vasilenko on irregularities in the referendum procedures. Vasilenko says that "there is an alarming report from Chuvashiya that anti-Yeltsin leaflets have been found in voting booths." Investigations are under way. "I think this will be referred to the relevant law enforcement bodies," she adds.

She says that a polling station in Krasnodar started the poll yesterday. "I have just received a report from polling station number 151 in the town of Krasnodar. For some reason, they decided to start the vote yesterday. This is a very serious breach of the law, as a result of which the chairman and secretary of the Kray electoral commission have been stripped of their responsibilities. The case has been sent to the procurator's office and the Central Electoral Commission in Moscow. The ballots used yesterday had to be confiscated, and the voting started again today in accordance with the law. So people will have to come for a second time. Perhaps they have already done so."

Vasilenko said that she found it "a little odd" that in some regions—for instance, Perm, Chelyabinsk, and Tyumen—the turnout in the countryside is "much higher" than in the towns.

Latest turnout by region:
Sakhalin 1800 hours - almost 52 percent;
Magadan 1800 hours - over 52 percent;
Kamchatka 1400 hours - 52.8 percent;
Tuva 1400 hours - 51.8 percent.

She said "according to the information that is coming in and that I am receiving, the turnout is generally quite high."

Confusion Over Ballot Validity

LD2504112993

[Editorial Report] Moscow Mayak Radio Network in Russian in its news bulletin at 1030 GMT on 25 April carried a live dispatch on the referendum by correspondent Natalya Tabunova from the Moscow city soviet's press center. She interviewed Aleksandr Popov, press secretary of the Moscow city soviet, on how the referendum has been progressing in Moscow. Popov gave figures from the Moscow city referendum commission for the turnout: as of 0915 GMT, 27.6 percent of the 6,905,709 registered voters had cast their ballots.

Popov also reported on problems that have arisen at polling stations as a result of confusion over the validity of ballots: "We are receiving information from Moscow city soviet deputies who are themselves observers of the referendum in Moscow. Unfortunately, the situation has been very difficult following yesterday's announcement on television by a spokesman for the Central Electoral Commission that ballots are valid only if they bear both two signatures of members of the polling station commission and a seal or stamp. Unfortunately, there was some confusion during that broadcast, because both the referendum law and a decision of the Central Electoral Commission itself say that it is necessary for the paper to be marked with either the signatures of commission members or a seal. However, Muscovites were confused—and I expect many Russian citizens generally were too—and this morning, there were very many reports from Muscovites who thought that they were being deceived and being given invalid voting papers at the polling stations and that these were forgeries and a provocation. At several polling stations, voters refused to cast their votes, quite a few voters took their ballot papers away, and at some stations they tried, in addition to crossing out the option with which they did not agree, to make a note on the ballot papers pointing out what was missing from those papers, either a seal or signatures from the station commission—thereby automatically spoiling those papers."

Popov explained what was now being done to rectify the problem: "At the Moscow city soviet and the Central Electoral Commission, all the telephone lines are occupied, as staff employees are explaining to people that a ballot paper is valid as long as it bears either a seal or a signature and that they should not be afraid if one or the other is missing. You can obtain full explanations from the chairman of the commission at the polling station where you go to vote. So, I want to tell Mayak's listeners again: Please, go and vote and collect your ballots."

Violations of Law Uncovered

LD2504124393 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1050 GMT 25 Apr 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent]

[Text] Moscow, 25 Apr—The referendum is heating up throughout Russia. By 1800 hours local time in Magadan Oblast 52.04 percent of voters had voted, not including the Magadan garrison and the "Magadanrybprom" [Magadan fishing industry] association. A similar turnout of those who had cast their votes has been recorded by the okrug electoral commission in Petropavlosk-Kamchatskiy.

Lyudmila Tsey, chairperson of the Krasnodar okrug electoral commission, told an ITAR-TASS correspondent that in Kuban there has been a better turnout for the referendum than for elections of people's deputies and even for the election of the Russian president. Here more than 1 million people have already voted, in other words one voter in three.

In the republic of Mariy El, a whole host of violations of the procedure for carrying out the referendum was uncovered within the first few hours of the referendum, an ITAR-TASS correspondent was told in the public headquarters of support for the president of Russia [obshchestvennyy shtab podderzhki Presidenta Rossii]. Some of the ballots, instead of having the official stamp, have been stamped with mysterious numbering. Several sets of ballots are being issued when one passport is being presented.

Officials of the procuracy in Ryazan have also recorded attempts to break the referendum law. At a number of polling stations young people with unauthorized passes from the mayor's office and the city council have turned up allegedly to "help the commissions". A mass issuing of butter coupons to voters has also been noted and the butter is being sold twice as cheaply as in the shops. Nevertheless, the turnout of Ryazan's voters for the referendum has been sufficiently high. The referendum in the oblast could already be said to be over, an ITAR-TASS correspondent was told in the okrug commission.

Popov Reports No 'Breaches'

LD2504141393 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1402 GMT 25 Apr 93

[By ITAR-TASS parliamentary correspondent Ivan Novikov]

[Text] Moscow April 25 TASS—The referendum opened everywhere in Russia in an orderly way, Yevgeniy Popov, member of the Central Electoral Commission of the all-Russia referendum, told ITAR-TASS.

True, one serious problem offered itself in the morning and had to be dealt with at once," he said. "There were requests from citizens about the required stamps and signatures on the referendum ballots. Explanations had been made in advance that in order to avoid rigging the results, each ballot should bear either the signatures of two members of the Electoral Commission at polling stations, or be rubberstamped. By ten a.m. the Central Commission asked Central Television and Radio to broadcast the required explanations." After that the stream of complaints from voters ceased. Yevgeniy Popov said that the Central Commission of the referendum had not received any information about breaches of order at polling stations or near them.

Observers Report No 'Excesses'

LD2504161893 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1600 GMT 25 Apr 93

[By unidentified ITAR-TASS correspondent]

[Text] Moscow April 25 TASS—Going by preliminary returns from all over Russia, the referendum has taken place, and in the overwhelming majority of cases it passed without breaches of law.

Nevertheless, there is no reason to say that observers had nothing to do. At a number of polling stations in Moscow, members of communist and national-patriotic organisations were openly engaged in canvasing against the president, ITAR-TASS was told by the Public Committee of Democratic Organisations in Support of Reforms. There were cases when members of electoral commissions prevented representatives of democratic organisations from participating in monitoring the referendum alongside others.

The Public Committee for the Defence of the Constitution and Constitutional System, formed with the participation of the bloc of groups of the "Russian Unity", "Officers' Union" and other political organisations circulated a statement saying that "the voting was accompanied by numerous occasions of rigging election returns to ensure the victory for the president and his version of reforms". The authors of the statement voice concern that "the referendum may be discredited and its results deliberately falsified in the president's favour".

Nevertheless, going by reports from various localities, at most of the 100,000 polling stations the voting passed without excesses.

Instances of Irregularities Detailed

LD2504214193 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 1900 GMT 25 Apr 93

[From the "Vesti" newscast]

[Text] ITAR-TASS reports that at polling station No. 175 in Rostov-on-Don the ballots containing the question concerning the president did not bear either a signature or a stamp, while those concerning the deputies were correctly authenticated. And Kravtsov, referendum observer from the Military for Democracy movement, discovered at polling station No. 251 in Rostov that there were specimens hanging in all the booths showing how to fill in the papers, effectively indicating what to cross out and what to leave.

In Stavropol, it was found that the voting lists had simply been copied from those compiled for the presidential election campaign two years ago, without any amendments to account for new arrivals or for departures.

Cases were also discovered in which residents in the main town of the region appeared twice on lists—under both their previous and new registered places of residence.

In Krasnodar, the director of a higher educational establishment personally distributed ballots to students in order, as he put it, to speed up the voting process. The papers were discounted and the vote continued as prescribed.

U.S. Observers: 'No Gross Violations'

LD2504195393 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1900 GMT 25 Apr 93

[Text] American observers noticed no gross violations in the course of the referendum in Moscow and Moscow oblast. David Evans, the representative of the Congressional Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, gave this information to an INTERFAX correspondent. According to him, observers visited over 20 polling stations in the Russian capital and one in the Shakhovskoy rayon in the area around Moscow. The Americans noted only that the premises were cramped and the lists of electors muddled.

'Majority' of Voting Without 'Violations'

LD2604091693 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 0850 GMT 26 Apr 93

[Text] Moscow April 26 TASS—Preliminary information coming in from various parts of Russia indicates that the referendum was carried out all over the country. It was held without violations of legislation in the overwhelming majority of constituencies.

Nevertheless, observers had enough work to do. It would have been improbable that such a large-scale event could have passed "without a hitch" in the multimillion state under the present conditions of society's politicization.

The confusion with marks made by Election Commissions, which was removed by midday as a result of a TV address by Chairman of the Central Election Commission Vasiliy Kazakov, provoked much agitation. [sentence as received]

However, there were signals about other violations. ITAR-TASS learnt at the non-government Committee of Democratic Organisations in Support of Reforms that members of communist and national-patriotic organisations in some Moscow election precincts conducted open anti-presidential agitation.

There were some cases when Election Commission members did not permit representatives from democratic organisations to participate in monitoring the referendum, along with other organisations.

ITAR-TASS reported from Abakan, the capital of Khakassia, that balloting papers at some polling stations were issued to voters without any identification documents, and signatures of commission members on balloting papers did not coincide.

It was permitted to vote "for another family member". Mass organisation observers remained indifferent to such cases.

There were no signatures or stamp on balloting papers, containing questions on confidence in the president and his policy, at the 175th polling station in the Oktyabriskiy District, Rostov-on-Don, while balloting papers on the re-election of the president and legislators were filled out correctly.

Election Commission members at the 251st polling station hung the so-called samples of filled out balloting papers at voting booths, prompting voters how to vote against the president.

On the other hand, the non-government Committee for the Protection of the Constitution and the Constitutional System formed with the participation of the opposition bloc of "Russian Unity", "Union of Army Officers", and some other political associations, claimed in its statement that the voting is "accompanied by a huge number of falsifications and forgeries, the aim of which is to ensure 'a victory' for the president and his version of reforms".

The statement's authors expressed apprehensions "over possible discredit of the referendum and the intention to distort its results in the president's favour"

Nevertheless, judging by reports from localities, the voting was held without violations at most of nearly 100,000 polling stations.

In the opinion of observers, statements about "mass" violations are necessary for some people to reserve the right (if the results are negative) to interpret the referendum results in their favour, even to the detriment of their own political reputation.

Russian Parliament Speaker Ruslan Khasbulatov also expressed concern on Sunday over possible violations at the referendum. It should be noted in this connection that the past Congress of People's Deputies (supreme legislature) charged the Russian Parliament (standing legislature) with the smooth organisation of the plebiscite.

Preliminary Figures Observed 25 Apr

Siberian Region Figures Given

LD2504092793 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 0800 GMT 25 Apr 93

[Text] According to preliminary data received by the INTERFAX agency, in constituency electoral commissions in the Siberian region, about 30 percent of the total number of voters had voted in the Republic of Khakassia by 1200 hours local time. In Krasnoyarsk kray, too, by 1200, about 30 percent of those eligible to vote had arrived at the ballot boxes; in Buryatia, 35 percent of the voters had come. In the Republic of Sakha-Yakutia, by 1200, over 51 percent of the electorate had cast its vote; in Irkutsk oblast about 28 percent and in Chuvashia only 6.3 percent of those eligible to vote had voted by 0800.

In Amur oblast, by 1200 hours, 36 percent of the electorate had voted. Here, parallel with the questions of the referendum, the voting paper includes a question on the election of the head of the oblast administration. According to the Russian news agency, at 0730, at polling station no. 3 in Irkutsk this morning, the corpse of a member of the commission for the referendum was discovered with traces of a violent death. The circumstances of the crime are being cleared up.

The situation in Chelyabinsk oblast on the day of the referendum is calm. All 2,306 polling stations are operating. None of them is empty. According to a report by the chairman of the constituency electoral commission, Vadim Kozlov, by 1200, 28.7 percent of the electorate on electoral list had taken part in the referendum. Voting is proceeding very energetically in the rural areas of the oblast. Together with the questions of the referendum, the people of Chelyabinsk are also being presented with voting papers for the election of the head of the local administration. As the present head of the oblast administration, Vadim Solovyev, whose powers were confirmed by a decree of Russia's president, does not intend to stand down, tomorrow Chelyabinsk oblast might find itself in the real situation of local diarchy.

Polls Close in East

LD2504133593 Moscow Ostankino Television First Channel Network in Russian 1100 GMT 25 Apr 93

[From the "Novosti" newscast]

[Text] Voting has already ended in Russia's eastern regions. As of now, it is known for certain that the referendum can be considered valid in Yakutia, the Kamchatka, Sakhalin, and Magadan oblasts, the Gorno-Altay republic, the republic of Tuva, and the Koryak national district. Over 50 percent of voters turned out in those regions.

Orenburg, Krasnoyarsk, Novosibirsk Report

LD2504122793 Moscow Programma Radio Odin Network in Russian 1100 GMT 25 Apr 93

[Text] We bring you reports on the progress of the all-Russian referendum. Despite predictions of sceptics about a probably low turnout of Russian citizens on the day of the referendum, the plebiscite is proceeding on a fairly large scale in the country.

According to data of the organizational department of Russia's Supreme Soviet, by 1100 hours Moscow time [0700 GMT], the referendum had already taken place in the Republic of Sakha-Yakutia, in Kamchatka oblast, in the Jewish Atonomous Oblast, and in Koryak national okrug, an ITAR-TASS correspondent was told by Russian Federation People's Deputy Vladimir Isakov. Over 50 percent of the population entered on the electoral rolls took part in the voting in these eastern regions. The highest turnout percentage—68.5 percent—was registered in Koryak national okrug.

By midday 35 percent of Buryatia's inhabitants had also expressed their will. Representatives of parties and movement are working calmly and in a businesslike atmosphere at Buryatia's polling stations.

In Orenburg oblast, despite the spring flash floods which have inundated several villages, 20-30 percent of the peasant voters have already voted. However, the protocols of the rayon commissions will be collected here, evidently, no earlier than 26 April as boats will have to be used to deliver them.

The first hours of voting on the Yenisey meridian are also marked by a brisk participation by the voters. This is also helped by the circumstance that today the Siberians are not only answering questions of the referendum but are also electing the head of administration of Krasnoyarsk kray and also the people's deputy for the national territorial constituency. Together with the first results of the poll, the Krasnoyarsk constituency electoral commissions and the representative of the Russian president have also began receiving signals on violations in the course of the voting. At a few polling stations the members of the commission are recommending their own variant of replies and in Nizhniy Ingash rayon observers, representing the East Siberian branch of the All- Russian Center for the Study of Public Opinion were removed from the hall.

A small turnout of voters is being observed in Novosibirsk oblast. Today some polling stations in Novosibirsk were virtually empty in the first hour.

There have been violations of the voting procedure today in Abakan, the capital of the Republic of Khakassia. At the polling stations ballot papers are being issued without presentation of passports, the signatures of commission members on the forms do not coincide, and voting for an other member of the family is being permitted. Public observers remain indifferent to such occurrences.

According to Anatoliy Malikhin, the president's representative in Kemerovo oblast, in the Kuzbass isolated violations of the law of the Russian Federation on the referendum are being removed on the spot. Information already in the possession of the representatives of polling station commissions in Kemerovo shows that by midday the flow of voters had intensified substantially and at a few polling stations the turnout approached 50 percent.

70 Percent Vote in Yakutia

LD2504151693 Moscow Ostankino Television First Channel Network in Russian 1445 GMT 25 Apr 93

[From the "Novosti" newscast]

[Text] With three hours to go before the polling stations close, Russia's referendum can already be termed a success, despite good weather. Igor Minayev, live from the Central Electoral Commission, reports that in eastern regions the turnout has been good. In Yakutia, almost 70 percent of the population has voted. Of the almost 300,000 Russian citizens living outside Russia, between 100,000 and 110,000 are thought to have voted.

There have been no serious incidents, though at some polling stations in Saratov, half-price sausages have been offered to tempt people to vote. Exact results from the eastern regions should be available tomorrow morning.

Several Regions Give First Results

LD2504161793

[Editorial Report] Moscow Ostankino Television First Channel Network in Russian at 1445 GMT on 25 April broadcasts an approximately 2-minute report by Sergey Dorenko, representing the TV6 channel. He reports from the ITAR-TASS studios, where information is coming in from correspondents of Ekho Moskvy radio, ITAR-TASS, and Interfax, which are joining TV6 and the first channel in today's information marathon.

Dorenko says that preliminary results are coming in, although these may be one or two percent above or below the official results:

Military settlements in Kaluga—56 percent for the president; 47.5 percent for the reforms; 37.1 percent for presidential elections; 49.7 percent for parliamentary elections.

One unspecified Far East military unit: 54 percent for the president; 40 percent for reform; 56 percent for presidental elections; 66 percent for parliamentary elections.

One Anadyr, Chukotka, constituency: 76 percent for the president; 68 percent for reforms; 63 percent for presidential elections; 81.8 percent for parliamentary elections.

The turnout in Sakhalin was lower than for the 1991 presidential elections, at 57 percent.

Dorenko says that TV6 and the first channel will be giving video updates throughout the night.

More Referendum Results Announced

LD2504164993 Moscow Mayak Radio Network in Russian 1555 GMT 25 Apr 93

[Telephone report by Mayak correspondent Olga Vasilenko]

[Excerpts] You know, it is correct that there is some time to go until 2200 [1800 GMT]—the voting ends at 2200. It may be said that, generally speaking, the referendum has taken place in Russia. This is what the information says. More than half of those Russians registered have taken part in the voting. [passage omitted]

You know, we already have the very first results from the very furthest Far East—here is Petropavlovsk-Kamchatskiy. The overall picture at 12 arbitrarily selected polling stations, at each polling station, is as follows:

Of those who voted, 76 percent support the president; the congress is supported by 20 percent; and 4 percent support neither the president nor congress.

Now for Chukotka; such information is already available from there, too. The president is supported by 75 percent, congress is supported by 20 percent. Five percent support neither of the sides.

However, this is only the first results, I think that they will be collected throughout the night and that information for other rayons will probably be arriving tomorrow. We shall have to wait for a fairly long time for the final results, as Vasiliy Ivanovich Kazakov [head of Referendum Commission], has told us.

Khabarovsk Kray Results Given

LD2504163393 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1600 GMT 25 Apr 93

[Text] The preliminary results of voting at a number of polling stations, mainly in military units, have become known. For example, according to unofficial data, at private polling stations of Khabarovsk kray within units of the Russian Army and Navy, 54 percent of the turnout replied in the affirmative to the first question, and 47 percent to the second question. A quarter of the voters came out in favor of early presidential elections, and 35 percent in favor of the re-election of people's deputies.

Let me remind you that these are preliminary results which have not been officially confirmed.

59 Percent of Moscow Electorate Votes

LD2504203093 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1900 GMT 25 Apr 93

[Text] We continue to inform our listeners about the course of the all-Russia referendum. According to information of 2100, in Moscow 59.1 percent of all the potential electors had participated in the referendum. Besides that, there is no infonnmation yet for 10 more districts of the capital.

In the country as a whole the population showed the greatest activity—about 70 percent turnout and over—in Karachayevo-Cherkessiya, in Chuvashiya, Bashkiriya, the Belgorod, Vologda, Voronezh, Kaluga, Kurgan, Omsk, Ryazan and Tambov oblasts, and several other oblasts. The least number of electors came to the polling stations in Tatarstan, Udmurtia, and Chukotka.

Early Results Show Majority for Yeltsin

LD2504214893

[Editorial Report] Moscow Ostankino Television First Channel Network in Russian at 2030 GMT on 25 April carries a 3-minute report by Sergey Dorenko on the latest vote-count results. Video shows Sergey Dorenko reporting from an ITAR-TASS bureau, showing polls result graphs, hand-drawn by himself.

Dorenko says: "We keep receiving preliminary reports on poll results from observers and journalists. Thus, Echo Moskvy correspondents reported to us here in the ITAR-TASS office unofficial results from one of Western regions.

"In military units in Kaliningrad, 48 percent for the president; 42 percent for the reform; 37 percent of the electoral roll for early presidential elections; and 60 percent of the electoral roll for early parliamentary elections.

"In Yakutia, the town of Mirnyy, 83.3 percent for the president; 80.8 percent for the reform; 37 percent of the electoral roll for early presidential elections; and 68 per cent for early parliamentary elections. We are not sure whether this last figure is taken on the basis of the roll, because 68 percent of the roll would be far too high, and is not borne out in other areas.

"In the oblast center of Magadan, 72 percent for the president; 64 percent for the reform; 18 percent of the electoral roll for early presidential elections; and 38 percent for early parliamentary elections."

After apologizing for imperfect graphs, Dorenko says: "Now, some reports on turnout: In Penza, Pskov, Ryazan, Tambov, and Voronezh oblasts, there was over 70 percent turnout throughout. Rostov Oblast comes second-worst after Tatarstan. According to our information the turnout was 64 percent. In Ulyanovsk, Yaroslavl, and Ivanovo oblasts it was about 70 percent."

More Preliminary Results Reported 26 Apr

Results From Embassies Abroad

LD2604040993 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 0100 GMT 26 Apr 93

[Text] Once again we return to the subject of the referendum. The RIA agency reports on the preliminary results of voting by Russian communities abroad. I will remind you that according to data from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs approximately 110,000 of our fellow citizens are working abroad. The Russian colony in Denmark resolutely supported President Yeltsin, Aleksey Obukhov, Russia's ambassador to Denmark, reported. Members of staff of the embassy, the permanent representation, and joint Russian-Danish enterprises took part in the voting.

In Finland more than 60 percent of those taking part in the voting voted for the President. Sixty-seven per cent replied Yes to the second question. Thirty-three and 79 percent respectively of those on the electoral roll voted for the re-election of the President and the parliament.

More than 86 percent of the voters took part in the referendum in the colony in Berlin. According to data from the embassy, 76 percent voted for Yeltsin. Sixty-nine percent of those who voted in favor of the reform that is being conducted.

In the Russian colony in Holland 59 percent of the participants in the referendum express support for the President. Most of the Russian citizens working in Portugal, Romania, Bulgaria, India and Nigeria voted for the President.

This was news from the RIA agency.

Results From Kuzbass Region Noted

LD2604052593 Moscow Mayak Radio Network in Russian 0324 GMT 26 Apr 93

[Excerpt] Our correspondent Vladimir Yuryev is on the line now from Kuzbass with information on the referendum in the largest coal-extracting field of Russia.

[Begin Yuryev recording] Good morning, Irina. The information I have is only preliminary since the results of the referendum are still being counted in the oblast. For example, the time here is just after 1100, the counting of the results in Novokuznetsk, a large town in

Kuzbass, was finished only at 0900 and only then it was revealed that the referendum had taken place because 51 percent of the voters had visited the polling stations. In Novokuznetsk over 67 percent of those who voted pledged their confidence in the Russian president.

As for other purely coal-mining towns: Leninsk-Kuznetskiy, Mezdurechinsk—incidentally, here Mezhdurechinsk is jokingly called the homeland of the revolution since the first miners' strikes began there—the referendum did not take place because the voters simply did not turn up at the polling stations. In Kemerovo 53 percent do not support, do not trust the president and 65 percent in another coal-mining town Berezovsk. I think that there is no need to reveal all the rest of the figures here since the final results for the whole of Kuzbass are not available so far and it should be noted that we have 2.172 million voters here. [end recording] [passage omitted]

Roundup of Regional Voting

LD2604144493

[Editorial Report] Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian at 0435 GMT on 26 April begins to carry a series of roundups of regional voting results. The following are summaries of the regional results.

Yaroslavl—Yeltsin got a firm endorsement in Yaroslavl Oblast. The local election commission has confirmed that the turnout was 67 percent. The "yes" vote, as a percentage of turnout, was 66.9 percent on question one and 61.8 on question two. Questions three and four were not supported by a majority of the electorate.

Khabarovsk—Provisional results are as follows: Turnout was 58.3 percent. The "yes" vote, as a percentage of turnout, was 70.2 on question one and 62.4 on question two. The "yes" vote, as a percentage of registered voters, was 26.3 on question three. Some 40.8 percent of the turnout supported early parliamentary elections.

Belgorod—Provisional figures: The "yes" vote, as a percentage of turnout, was roughly 40 on question one. About two-thirds of the turnout voted "no" on question two. Less than half the registered voters voted "yes" on the two questions on early elections.

Stavropol—Prrovisional figures: The overall turnout was 68.4 percent. The "yes" vote, as a percentage of turnout, was over 52 on question one. The "yes" vote on question two was only 47.7 percent. Voters in the kray were against the idea of fresh presidential and parliamentary elections.

Vologda—Provisional figures: Over 50 percent of the oblast's voters who turned out voted "yes" on question one. But the idea of fresh presidential and parliamentary elections was turned down. An overwhelming majority of Vologda voters voted "yes" on an additional question: "Should Russia's krays and oblasts enjoy the same rights as republics in the Russian Federation?"

Ulyanovsk—Official results: Slightly over 720,000 of the oblast's 1,050,000 voters turned out. The "yes" vote, as a percentage of turnout, was 47.5 on question one. The "no" vote on the same question was 50.4 percent. The equivalent figures for question two were 43.7 for and 54.2 against. Some 39.9 percent of the turnout wanted fresh presidential elections, while 26.3 were against. Altogether, 43.7 percent of the electors wanted fresh parliamentary elections.

Novosibirsk—Provisional results: The "yes" vote, as a percentage of turnout, was 54.6 on question one, but only 48.4 on question two. Some 32.6 percent of electors voted for early presidential elections, 42.9 percent for early parliamentary elections. The president won 65 percent support in Novosibirsk city, but only 43 percent in the districts.

Cheboksary—Provisional results: Turnout in Chuvashia was almost 75 percent. The "no" vote, as a percentage of the turnout, was 60 on question one, and 63 on question two. Support for Yeltsin was much stronger in the towns. Less than half the registered voters wanted early presidential and parliamentary elections.

Voronezh—Provisional results: Many voting slips were spoiled or not cast. The "yes" vote, as a percentage of turnout, was 49.7 on question one. The "no" vote on this question was 48.5. Some 45.1 percent of Voronezh voters voted "yes" on question two, while 53 percent voted "no." The "yes" vote, as a percentage of turnout, was 39.7 on question three and 46.5 on question four.

Irkutsk—Provisional results: Turnout in the oblast was 60 percent, or over 1,100,000 registered voters. The "yes" vote, expressed as a percentage of turnout, was 58 percent on question one and 52 percent on question two. The "yes" vote, as a percentage of registered voters, was 30 on question three and slightly over 40 on question four.

Yekaterinburg—According to the constitutency election commission, 68 percent of voters took part in the referendum in Sverdlovsk Oblast. The "yes" vote, expressed as a percentage of turnout, was 84 on question one, the "no" vote 14.3. The equivalent results for question two were 75.6 percent for, and 22.2 against. The results on question three, as expressed as a percentage of registered voters, were 22.4 for and 42.7 against; on question four, 53.5 for and 11.9 against. The referendum in Sverdlovsk Oblast included an extra question on whether the oblast should enjoy the same powers as Russian Federation republics. The answer to this was 54.8 percent for and 9.4 against.

Maykop (Republic of Adygey)—Provisional results: A majority of the turnout voted "no" on questions one and two, and "yes" on question three. Turnout in the republic was 64.5 percent of the registered vote.

Krasnodar—Provisional results: Over 60 percent of the turnout in Krasnodar city voted "yes" on question one. A majority voted "yes" on question two as well. A majority of Krasnodar voters do not want fresh presidential elections, but they do want new parliamentary elections. The overall turnout in the city was slightly over 50 percent.

Ashgabat—According to the Russian Embassy, 6,609 of the 6,798 Russian citizens in Turkmenistan whose names appear on the electoral register took part in the referendum. Some 66.1 percent of them voted "yes" on question one, 59.7 on question two. Some 45.2 percent of the electors called for early presidential elections, and 73.7 percent for early parliamentary elections.

Ufa—Turnout in Bashkortostan was 70.8 percent. The "yes" vote, as a percentage of turnout, was 39.6 on question one and 35.9 on question two. The "yes" vote was 41.9 percent on question three and 37.8 on question four. A fifth question was also voted on: Whether the Republic of Bashkortostan should have full economic independence from the center. The result of this, as a percentage of turnout, was 75.5 percent in favor.

Ingushetia—Provisional figures: Turnout was 75 percent. No serious violations of voting procedures were reported.

North Ossetia—Official results are not yet known. According to the chairman of local election commission, 63.3 percent of citizens voted "yes" on question one, 56.1 on question two, 35.3 on question three, and 47.6 on question four.

Kyzyl—An extra question was voted on at the referendum in Tuva: Do inhabitants of this agricultural republic want the introduction of private ownership of land? Provisional results of voting now make it clear that the majority of citizens are against the new draft law. The republic's central election commission will announce official results tomorrow.

Nalchik—Turnout in Kabardino-Balkaria was 58.9 percent. Some 62.1 percent of the turnout voted "yes" on question one, but 65.1 percent voted "no" on question two. Early presidential elections are favored by 36.6 percent, early parliamentary elections by 31.2 percent.

Archangel—Because of impassable roads, not even provisional results are available yet. According to incomplete figures, the turnout was over 65 percent of those entitled to vote.

Penza—Final results: Turnout in the oblast was 70.7 percent. The "yes" vote, as a percentage of the turnout, was 45.3 on question one, while the "no" vote was 52.6. The "no" vote on question two, again as a percentage of turnout, was 56.6, while the "yes" vote on this was 41.1. The vote on question three, as a percentage of registered voters, was 41.6 for and 26.9 against. Some 40.7 percent of the registered voters wanted early parliamentary elections.

Tallinn—According to provisional figures, about 30 percent of the 32,000 citizens of Russia living in the republic took part in the all-Russian referendum in Estonia. At the moment, however, it is not clear whether this includes servicemen stationed here who took part in the referendum. About 3,000 people took part in the referendum in Narva, where there was a separate polling station for the 10,000 Russian citizens living in northeast Estonia. The Russian Embassy in Tallinn has not yet given any information about the results of the referendum.

Samara—Provisional figures: The "yes" vote, as a percentage of turnout, was 63 percent on question one and 55 on question two, but two-thirds of rural voters were against Yeltsin and his team.

Tambov—Provisional figures: 44 percent of electors voted "yes" on question one. The turnout was 74 percent of the 982,660 registered voters.

Kursk—Provisional figures: Turnout was 70.1 percent. The "no" vote, as a percentage of turnout, was 56 on question one and 59.1 on question two. Some 42 percent want early presidential elections, and 38.6 percent early parliamentary elections.

Kirov—According to provisional figures, slightly more than 238,000 residents of Kirov city took part in the referendum. This is 62.7 percent of registered voters. The "yes" vote, as a percentage of turnout, was 72 on question one and 62 on question two. Some 53 percent were against early presidential elections, while 74.9 percent of the turnout wanted early parliamentary elections. The citizens of Kirov also voted on whether to change the name of their city. Only 21 percent of voters who turned out wanted to restore the city's former name of Vyatka.

Kaliningrad—Provisional results: Turnout in the oblast was 63.5 percent. The "yes" vote, as a percentage of turnout, was 60 on question one and 52.5 on question two. The results on question three, as a percentage of registered voters, were 31 for and 31 against. Early parliamentary elections were favored by 45 percent.

Tula—Provisional results: Turnout was almost 68 percent of the 1,500,000 electors in the oblast. The "yes" vote was 61.1 percent on question one and 55.6 on question two. Early presidential elections were favored by 33.7 percent and early parliamentary elections by 45.7 percent.

Kurgan—Each of the four questions was answered by over 70 percent of registered voters. The "yes" vote, expressed as a percentage of turnout, was 50.32 on question one and 44.4 on question two. The "no" vote on the latter question was 52 percent, accounted for mainly by rural voters. Turnout was higher in rural areas. The "yes" vote, as a percentage of registered voters, was 38.5 on question three and 44.2 on question four.

Perm—Provisional figures: Question one—76.6 percent for, 21 percent against; Question two—68.7 per cent for, 28.4 against. The results on question three, as a percentage of registered voters, were 24.5 for and 33.9 against. Over 43 percent voted "yes" to early parliamentary elections.

Abakan—Provisional figures for the Republic of Khakassia: Turnout was slightly over 50 percent. The "yes" vote, as a percentage of turnout, was 57.9 on question one and almost the same on question two. The figures on question three were 28.8 percent for and 26 percent against. The figures on question four were 37.4 for and 17.7 against.

Vilnius—The only polling station in the republic was set up in the Russian Embassy. Some 1,081 of the almost 4,500 Russian citizens registered at the consular section voted in the referendum. According to Ambassador Nikolay Obertyshev, who chaired the polling station commission, the most active voters were residents of the capital, as well as those of Visaginas, which is mainly inhabited by Russian citizens employed by the Ignalina nuclear power station. Most of those who turned out voted against the president's reform policies, he said. Explaining the low turnout of Russian citizens living in Lithuania, the ambassador stressed that they live in various districts a long way from Vilnius. The journey to the capital is not only difficult but also expensive. There were no significant violations of electors' rights during the voting, which was monitored by observers from a number of public organizations.

Almaty—The only polling station in Kazakhstan was set up in the Russian Embassy in Almaty. Altogether, 49 out of 51 registered voters voted. They were mainly embassy staff, Russian citizens on secondment in the republic, and permanent residents who have Russian citizenship. Two-thirds voted "yes" on questions one, two, and four. One-third voted "yes" on question three.

Yerevan—Some 73 Russian citizens voted at the only polling station in Armenia. The results have been forwareded to Moscow.

Further on Regional Results

LD2604081393 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 0541 GMT 26 Apr 93

[Text] [no dateline as received]—Vladivostok. Voting results have been summed up in Vladivostok. The turnout was 51.9 per cent of the electorate. 71.38 per cent of the electors answered in the affirmative to the question whether or not they back Yeltsin, and only 26.63 per cent answered in the negative. 63.99 per cent of the electors approve the socio-economic policy pursued by the Russian President and Government. Concerning the third and fourth questions, the votes were counted proceeding from the total number of potential electors. 20.5 per cent of the electors supported pre- term presidential elections and 29.5 per cent voted against it. 38.64 per cent believe pre-term parliamentary elections are necessary, and 11.52 per cent oppose the idea.

Khabarovsk. According to the Referendum Commission for the Khabarovsk Region, the turnout there was 56.7 per cent, Deputy Chairman of the Regional Commission Anatoliy Rizayev said. The activity of residents of the large cities—Khabarovsk and Komsomolsk-on-Amur—played the decisive role, the turnout there was 55.4 and 50.6 per cent respectively, he continued. Residents of Amursk, a city dominated by the timber chemical industry, showed unexpectedly low activity: Less than half of potential voters came to the polling stations. The results of the referendum in Amursk were found to have no legal force. The processing of incoming information is going on. The Khabarovsk City Commission for organising the referendum reports that 249,195 people out of 440,294, who are on the list of electors, took part in the voting. 74.9 per cent of them gave a vote of confidence to the president, and 67.7 per cent supported the reform course of the president and the government. Concerning the third and fourth questions, on which votes are counted proceeding from a total number of potential electors, 23.2 per cent supported pre-term presidential elections, while 23.5 per cent opposed them. 40.8 per cent of Khabarovsk residents believe pre-term parliamentary elections are necessary.

Krasnoyarsk. The preliminary analysis of the referendum returns from rural areas of the Krasnoyarsk region, that reached the Regional Commission by 07.00 in the morning, shows that Yeltsin has been given a vote of confidence by the overwhelming majority of the electors. The number of those who support the president's economic policy is smaller, but still more than a half said yes. People are turning down with a small margin the idea of pre-term presidential elections. As for pre-term parliamentary elections, the number of those who support the idea is two to three times greater than the number of those who oppose it. No information has come so far about the results of the referendum in the city of Krasnoyarsk.

Simultaneously with the referendum, the elections of the head of the local administration were held in the Krasnoyarsk Region. At the moment, the acting head of the local administration Valeriy Zubov is well ahead of his rival.

Orenburg. The preliminary results show that Orenburg residents have given a vote of confidence to the Russian President. According to the Regional Electoral Commission, they have information only on 14 districts so far, but even this information makes it clear that more than half of those who took part in the voting backed Yeltsin. In some cities and villages, for example the villages of Chernorechye, Nezhinka and Yunoe, the percentage is even higher. 75 per cent of officers and men at military garrisons backed Yeltsin. 61 per cent of Orenburg electors also gave them a vote of confidence.

Yuzhno-Sakhalinsk. More than a half of the Sakhalin and Kuril residents, who took part in the referendum, backed President Yeltsin and the reform policy pursued by him. According to the preliminary results, 60.8 per cent and 51.5 per cent respectively answered in the affirmative to the first and second questions of the referendum. About 27 per cent of a total number of eligible voters of the Sakhalin region believe that pre-term presidential elections are necessary, while some 40 per cent of them supported the idea of pre-term parliamentary elections. Yeltsin got overwhelming support in the Kuril islands, which is one of the most difficult areas from the political and socio-economic points of view. No reports came about violations of the referendum law, head of the regional electoral commission Valentin Mazur told ITAR-TASS.

Petropavlovsk-Kamchatskiy. 70.4 per cent of Kamchatka voters backed the Russian president and 61.6 per cent assessed positively the socio-economic policy pursued by the president and the government. Those preliminary results were received by ITAR-TASS at the regional electoral commission. Some 45 per cent of all eligible voters, which makes 75 per cent of those who took part in the voting, favour early parliamentary elections, while only 24.5 per cent voted for the pre-term elections of the head of state. The turnout was rather high in the Kamchatka region—60.6 per cent. The figure was even higher in the Koryak autonomous district—72.8 per cent. However, the overall make-up there was not very much different from the above mentioned figures: 67 per cent of the voters backed the president, 54.6 per cent approved his policy, 32.7 per cent supported pre-term presidential elections and more than a half—52.1 per cent of all voters in the Koryak district—supported pre-term parliamentary elections.

Krasnoyarsk. Preliminary results of the referendum in Krasnoyarsk became known by 08.00, local time. Some two thirds of about 360,000 Krasnoyarsk residents, who took part in the voting, backed prsident Yeltsin. Most of the voters approved of his economic policy. Those who advocated early elections of the head of state turned out to be in the minority. Two thirds of participants in the referendum favour the idea of pre-term parliamentary elections.

Sochi. Some 165,000 people, which makes 64 per cent of a total number of eligible voters of that resort city, took part in the referendum. 75.5 per cent of those who took part in the voting supported President Yeltsin. 69 per cent of Sochi residents approve of the socio-economic policy pursued by the president and the government. A little less than 40 per cent of voters believe pre- term presidential elections are necessary and 76 per cent of them favour early parliamentary elections.

Novgorod. 59.4 per cent of Novgorod residents, who took part in the voting, resolutely supported the president. As was expected, the turnout was rather high in the Novgorod region—68.3 per cent of eligible voters. 53 per cent of participants in the referendum approved the socio-economic policy of the Yeltsin team. Only one third of Novgorod residents voted for pre-term elections of the head of state, and 44.6 per cent of all eligible voters supported the idea of early parliamentary elections. Commenting on the preliminary results of the voting at the request of ITAR-TASS, the president's representative for the Novgorod region Anatoliy Kuznetsov said that the support rendered by Novgorod residents to President Yeltsin on all the three questions is evidence of their desire to see the radical reform policy continued.

Ulyanovsk. Some 69 per cent of eligible electors of the Ulyanovsk region took part in the referendum. The referendum did take place, but the regional electoral commission is not yet ready to make public its preliminary results. According to observers, a little less than 45 per cent of participants in the voting answered in the affirmative to the first question.

Petrozavodsk. According to preliminary results of the referendum in Karelia, 65 per cent of those who took part in the referendum gave a vote of confidence to the president and 56.5 per cent approved his socio-economic policy. 30 per cent of all eligible voters supported the idea of early presidential elections and 42.7 per cent—of early parliamentary elections. The turnout was 63 per cent.

Rostov-on-Don. Rural dwellers of the Rostov region gave a vote of no confidence to President Yeltsin. According to the preliminary information coming to the regional commission, most electors from the rural areas of the Rostov region answered in the negative to the first question of the referendum. 48 per cent of voters of the Tsimlyansky district said yes to the first question of the referendum. The figure for the Rodionovo-Nesvetaiskiy district is 36.6 per cent and for the Milyutinskiy district—32 per cent. The situation is the opposite in cities. For instance, 72 per cent of electors in Rostov-on-Don backed President Yeltsin. The figure for Novocherkassk is 58.6 per cent. Vote counting is going on.

Penza. The turnout was rather high in the Penza region—about 70 per cent. They resolutely supported the idea of holding pre-term elections of both the executive and legislative authorities. According to preliminary data, 41.5 per cent of electors (against 26.8 per cent) voted for pre-term presidential elections and 40.7 per cent (against 28.1 per cent)—for early parliamentary elections. 52.6 per cent of electors gave a vote of no confidence to the president, and 56.6 per cent of Penza electors do not approve the reform policy.

Barnaul. The preliminary vote counting in the Altay region showed that 47.7 per cent of voters, who took part in the referendum, back President Yeltsin. More than a half—54.4 per cent of them—oppose the current socio-economic policy. Some 40 per cent of Altay electors support early elections both of the executive and legislative authorities.

Referendum Held 'Successfully'

LD2604073193 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 0700 GMT 26 Apr 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Lyudmila Yermakova]

[Text] Moscow, 26 Apr—Sixty-two per cent of the citizens registered on the voting lists took part in the referendum. It was held successfully in all regions except for Chechnya and also Tatarstan, where 21 percent voted. This information was given at a session of the Presidium of the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet by Vasiliy Kazakov, chairman of the Central Electoral Commission. He commented that the voting proceeded calmly, especially in the Far Eastern regions - "there were no major incidents".

The largest vote in support of the president on the first question was cast by the electors of the Magadan and Kamchatka constituencies - over 70 percent. He gained over 60 percent in the Sakhalin, Yakut, Maritime, Vladimir, Jewish, and Koryak constituencies. Only in one constituency - the Koryak - did over half the voters back early elections of deputies.

The Commission obtained this information from just over 10 constituencies by telephone and telegram.

Electoral Commission Head Details Results

LD2604102593 Moscow Mayak Radio Network in Russian 0700 GMT 26 Apr 93

[Text] [Announcer] From the Russian White House, our special correspondent Aleksandr Ruvinskiy reports.

[[Ruvinskiy] Here, near the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet building, a session of the Supreme Soviet Presidium is taking place now. And, of course, the deputies have been discussing some of the preliminary results of the referendum that took place yesterday in the Russian Federation. Vasiliy Ivanovich Kazakov, the chairman of the central commission on holding the referendum, made a speech. Here is what he said:

[Begin Kazakov recording] What can I tell you now? I can tell you with complete clarity that the referendum has taken place, because by 2200 yesterday, and in some places by 2100—depending on the time zone—62 percent had already voted. The referendum has taken place and is valid in all oblasts and republics, except for the Chechen Republic—where it was not held at all—and Tataria, where at 2000 the turnout was 21 percent. All the other republics and oblasts held the referendum.

The referendum itself has been held in a calm atmosphere, especially in Siberia and the Far East. According to our information and the information of Valentin Georgiyevich, with whom I spoke with several times yesterday, there were no major incidents, but in Ingushetia one of the polling stations in a disputed area was, roughly speaking, seized. There was one of our four specialists there, his name is Roshchilin, who called me yesterday. They organized the voting at a nearby polling station. There was no bloodshed there, so everything was more or less normal.

There were a lot of complaints about leaflets being left somewhere by a previous voter in a voting booth; somewhere else propaganda took place; somewhere else old resolutions were read on the day of the vote that could be considered as some kind of violation. There were complaints that people were not allowed to vote without coupons or—somewhere else—with coupons. But all these complaints were of a local character.

The biggest number of complaints came from Moscow about a note on voting papers. Taking into account the significance of this question and the fact that many deputies yesterday paid a lot of attention to this, I would like to tell you a little bit about it. Unfortunately, in the law on referendums we do not have any norms that would protect voting papers. That is why sometime in January we made some amendments to the law, but because of some circumstances it has been given only its first reading in both chambers and was not adopted. So we were forced to adopt a special decision about a special distinguishing note on ballots on 2 April. The decision of the commission was adopted. According to this decision, all ballots should be signed on the back by at least two members of the commission or should be marked by a stamp if they have a stamp. Some constituency commissions do not have stamps; they did not have them made because there was no need for the stamps before. So we recommended that they borrow stamps from local enterprises, from rayon executive committees, etc, and make the distinguishing mark in that way. By and large, this has gone well in all areas; it did not lead to any incidents.

In Moscow the city constituency commission decided to allow district commissions and polling station commissions to use various types of stamps. Well, since our decision did not say the voting papers had to be authenticated as a document, we felt that this would do as a distinguishing mark. The stamps were of different kinds. When I voted, I saw that roughly half the voting paper was covered by an impression saying: council of the local directorate of [name indistinct] rayon, and so on. When voters came up to me, I explained that it would be difficult to forge them.

But in a number of other cases, efforts were clearly being made to wreck the referendum, or at least discredit it, by causing dissatisfaction among the voters. Some stamps were crudely made, with impressions like expired, paid, stadium [laughter].

[Russian Supreme Soviet Chairman Ruslan Khasbulatov] Paid—that's good!

[Kazakov] There were even stamps designed for the collection of party dues. Workshop No. 3 was another example. I think the purpose of all this was absolutely clear. But in other instances the motive may not have been political. It may simply have been ignorance or a failure to appreciate the importance of these stamps.

Yesterday I discussed the matter with the chairman of the Kirovskiy Rayon commission. Polling station chairmen were also there. On the eve of the referendum, the Kirovskiy commission decided it would issue distinguishing marks for each polling station. In one instance it was a small rhombus with the figure 3. In another instance it was a small square. There was even a small rose, in another case.

But they did this officially. The symbols were endorsed by the commission. The original stamps were held by the commission chairman. Nobody else had them. The intention was to prevent other voting slips being received by that commission. So that was an issue, of course.

Yesterday, five members of our commission were here. We took advice from lawyers. We consider, on the whole, that since these are, after all, distinguishing marks, there is no good reason to challenge their use.

Now for the results. So far we have only received one telegram, which for us is an official document. I can only talk this way because various inquiries have not been completed in individual oblasts. But I have received reports over the telephone. Before a telegram can be sent, a meeting of the official commission has to be held. But I have had telephoned reports from another 12 constituencies. We received seven of them, the other five were received by Viktor Nikolayevich Vadim. We have pooled them after consulting each other.

The first question—on confidence [in the president], as you know—has been provided by the commissions as a percentage of those who actually voted, as has the second on policies, whereas the third and fourth questions are given as a percentage of registered voters. These are just examples, for, I repeat, they are not final figures:

Sakhalin—61 percent on the first question, then 51 percent, 27 percent, and 39.8 percent.
Yakutia—68, 61, 32, 48.
Kamchatka—70, 61.6, 24.5, 45.3.
Maritime kray—64, 57, 23, 38.
Amur oblast—43, 39, 37, 34.
Aga-Buryat—48.9, 42.8—this is official data—41.5, 43.7.
Novosibirsk—I have just been speaking to [word indistinct] There has been flooding in a number of districts, but he told me the figure on question one was 55 percent and 40 percent on question four. The final figures are not yet in for the other questions.
Gornyy Altay—43.6, 43.4, 37.9, 40.8.
Vladimir Oblast—I also got these over the telephone—65.8, 58, 34.6, 47.6.
Magadan—74.4, 65, 23, 43.5
Jewish Oblast—58.6, 52.3, 29.4, 38.4
Koryak—67, 54, 33, 52.1. This is the only constituency so far, out of 13, where more than 50 percent have voted for early parliamentary elections. But this is only a small constituency.
Bashkiria—I have just been speaking to the chairman. The figures there are 42, 36.5, 41.6, 37.9. There too there is flooding in three districts. Results have not come in from there. But they will not make any difference.

Those are the provisional results that have been received so far, Ruslan Imranovich. We will receive more during the day. Then tomorrow we will probably have some sort of general picture available. [end recording]

Tver, Novgorod, Saratov Report

LD2604090893 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 0700 GMT 26 Apr 93

[Text] In Tver Oblast, more than 69 percent of those entitled to vote did so. Almost 54 percent of them expressed confidence in the Russian president, and more than 49 percent supported his economic policies. More than a third of registered voters voted for new presidential elections, and 45 percent voted for new elections of people's deputies.

Almost 60 percent of those who voted in the referendum in Novgorod Oblast voted yes to the first question, and more than half agreed with the economic policies being pursued by the president and the government. A third of the electorate thought new presidential elections were necessary, and 45 percent thought early elections of people's deputies were necessary.

More than half of those who voted in Saratov Oblast support the President, INTERFAX reports. A third of registered voters were in favor of new presidential elections, and more than 44 percent were in favor of early deputy elections.

Preliminary Results From Sverdlovsk

LD2604090393 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 0800 GMT 26 Apr 93

[Text] Our correspondent from Yekaterinburg, Ella Erkamashvili, has reported that, according to preliminary data obtained by the Russian president's mission in Sverdlovk Oblast, 68 percent of registered voters in the Central Urals took part in the referendum on 25 April. Of them, 84 percent voted yes on the question of confidence in the president, while 14 percent voted no.

The policies of the president and government were approved by 75 percent of those who voted in the referendum and were not approved by 22 percent. Of registered voters in Sverdlovsk Oblast, 22 percent voted for early presidential elections, and 53 percent voted for early deputy elections.

According to the preliminary results, on the extra question: Do you agree that Sverdlovsk Oblast should enjoy equal rights in terms of its powers with the republics within the Russian Federation?, 81 percent of the population voted yes.

St. Petersburg Results Reported

LD2604100293 Moscow Mayak Radio Network in Russian 0930 GMT 26 Apr 93

[Text] According to preliminary results from St. Petersburg, more than 62 percent of voters took part in Russia's nationwide referendum. For Leningrad Oblast, the figure was 64.9 percent.

From the results of two rayons in St. Petersburg, one can gain an impression of the results of the referendum in the city. Thus, in the Moscow Rayon—the largest industrial area—73 percent of voters voted for the president; 75 percent were in favor of the socioeconomic reforms; 75 percent of those who took part in the referendum said yes to early elections of the deputies' corps—this was 51 percent of the electorate—and only 37 percent who went to the polling stations voted for the early election of the president. This was 22 percent of the electorate.

Comparing these figures, one sees that, most likely, many simply took the ballot papers for the third question home with them.

Mordovia Results Reported

LD2604130593 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1100 GMT 26 Apr 93

[Text] Nikolay Vyachkayev, our correspondent in Saransk, Mordovia, reports that about 70 percent of the those registered to vote in Mordovia turned out for the nationwide referendum. Over half of those who turned out voted no on the first question, on confidence in President Boris Yeltsin; the president won support only in two rayons. The final figures for the other questions are not yet available.

Further TASS Roundup

LD2604161293 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1446 GMT 26 Apr 93

[Text] Samara [no date as received]—According to tentative figures, 63 per cent of the Samara region's population who took part in the April 25 referendum supported President Boris Yeltsin. The policy pursued by him is approved by 55 per cent of the region's eligible voters. These are mostly town dwellers. Two thirds of rural residents voted against Yeltsin and his policy.

Tambov—According to preliminary estimates, 44 per cent of the Tambov region's voters said "yes" to the president. Anatoliy Sotnikov, chairman of the district commission for the holding of the referendum, said the voter turnout was on the whole heavy—74 per cent of 982,660 eligible voters came to polling stations.

Kursk—The district commission reported that 70.1 per cent of voters took part in the referendum. Fifty six per cent of voters said they did not trust the president, 59.1 per cent do not support the present socio-economic policy, 42 per cent want early presidential elections and 38.6 per cent—early elections of people's deputies.

Kirov—Slightly more than 238,000 residents of the city took part in the referendum or 62.7 per cent of the total electorate, according to tentative counts. The overwhelming majority of them—72 per cent—said they trusted the Russian president. The socio- economic policy won the approval of 62 per cent of voters, 53 per cent voted against re-electing the president and 74.9 per cent—voted for re-electing the pool of deputies. The residents of Kirov also voted on whether to rename their city. Only 21 per cent of them said they wanted to return the old name of Vyatka to their city.

Ingushetia—The voter turnout in the Ingush Republic was high. A spokesman in Ingushetia's Central Election Commission told ITAR-TASS today that 75 per cent of the population took part in the referendum, according to tentative estimates. The final results will become known after vote counts are received from remote highland villages. No serious abuses in the voting procedure were recorded.

North Ossetia—Official information on the results of the vote in the republic will become known only in the afternoon. However, according to North Ossetian Central Election Commission head Agube Kuchiyev, the referendum highlighted the alignment of political forces in the republic. The number of citizens who said they trusted Russian President Boris Yeltsin amounted to 63.3 per cent, 56.1 per cent approved the socio-economic policy that has been pursued by the president and government since 1992. The number of citizens who answered "yes" on the third question was 35.3 per cent, 47.6 per cent answered "yes" on the fourth issue.

Kyzyl—During the referendum Tuva tried to find an answer to the additional question of whether the residents of the agrarian republic want the introduction of private land ownership. The preliminary results of the vote make it possible to say already today that the majority of residents treat negatively the new draft law. The republican Central Election Commission will report the official results tomorrow.

Nalchik—The vote count showed that 58.9 per cent of the population took part in the referendum in Kabardino-Balkariya, 62.1 per cent of voters said they did not trust Boris Yeltsin, 65.1 per cent opposed the socio-economic policy pursued by the president and government of the Russian Federation, 36.6 per cent—voted for the early elections of the president and 31.2 per cent—for the early elections of Russian people's deputies.

Arkhangelsk—Even the preliminary results of the all-Russian referendum will become known in the Arkhangelsk region only by Tuesday [27 April] midday, District Election Commission Chairman Vasiliy Sysoyev told ITAR-TASS. He explained that spring floods made roads impassable in rural areas in the north of Arkhangelsk, which in turn delayed the collection and processing of the poll results. According to tentative figures of the district commission, more than 65 per cent of the eligible voters took part in the poll.

Penza—The final results of the vote in the Penza region showed that 70.7 per cent of voters took part in the referendum, 45.3 per cent of them said they trusted President Yeltsin and 52.6 per cent refused to put trust in him, 56.6 per cent did not approve the socio-economic policy pursued by the president and the Russian Government and 41.1 per cent approved this policy. The count revealed that 41.6 per cent of the total electorate deemed it necessary to hold early elections for Russian president and 26.9 per cent recognised them as undesirable. Estimates also showed that 40.7 per cent of all eligible voters regard the holding of early elections for people's deputies as necessary.

Tallinn—According to tentative figures, about 30 per cent of 32,000 Russian citizens participated in the all-Russian referendum in Estonia. However, it is not yet clear whether these figures include servicemen who are stationed here. Some 3,000 people took part in the poll in Narva where a separate polling station was opened for 10,000 Russian citizens residing in north-eastern Estonia. The Russian Embassy in Tallinn has yet to report the outcome of the referendum.

Kalmykia Voting Results

LD2604173393 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 1600 GMT 26 Apr 93

[Report from Kalmykia--from the "Vesti" newscast]

[Text] In Kalmykia, total turnout in the referendum was 65 percent, ranging from 56 percent in the capital, Elista, to 75 and 78 percent in two remote rayons, Yustinskiy and Gorodovikovskiy.

The majority answered "yes" to questions 1 and 2, and "no" to questions 3 and 4.

A vote of confidence in the social-economic policy of President Yeltsin and his government also means reaffirmed support for the program of newly elected Kalmykian President Kirsan Ilyumzhimov. At his first meeting with Yeltsin and the Russian Government after his election, Ilyumzhinov put forward two proposals: to introduce a system of preferential taxation in Kalmykia, and to give up the expected annual subsidy to the republic, worth 20 billion rubles.

'Observer' Comments on Results

LD2604160793 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1117 GMT 26 Apr 93

[By ITAR-TASS observer Aleksandr Mineyev; "Corps of Deputies Does Not Accurately Reflect the Will of the People"—ITAR-TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, 26 Apr—Preliminary results of the all-Russian referendum confirm that the views of the Russian Congress of People's Deputies and the will of Russia's citizens are by no means identical. Less than a month ago, at the Ninth Congress of People's Deputies, 617 out of the 1,033 deputies (or one might say out of the 909 who took part in the vote) favored stripping Boris Yeltsin of his post as president. His opponents fell just 72 votes short of the number necessary to start impeachment procedures.

In most regions from which preliminary reports about the referendum results have arrived today, more than 50 percent of the voters supported the president. Moreover, even the tricky second question, the one about support for the government's socioeconomic policy, did not shake the overall picture of prevailing support for Boris Yeltsin.

In Sakhalin and the Kuril Islands, the first and the second questions were answered in the affirmative by, respectively, 60.8 and 51.5 percent of those who voted. In Kamchatka, the respective figures are 70.4 and 61.6 percent; in Novosibirsk, 65.8 and over 57; in Sochi, 75.5 and 69.0 percent; in Novgorod Oblast, 59.4 and 53.0; in Karelia, 65.0 and 56.5.

Even in the regions where the president failed to get a majority (such as Chita, Ulyanovsk, and Penza Oblasts, Altay kray, and rural areas of the Don region), the percentage of his supporters rarely fell below 40. So far there have been no reports of any localities where a qualified majority supported early presidential elections (however the question about early elections of deputies is also unlikely to get the necessary 50 percent of the electoral roll).

It is of course too early to draw final conclusions. When the voting results from all the regions are summed up, we will have a more precise picture. What is obvious, however, is that the president has already received the necessary credit of confidence to press on with the policy of reform, whereas the deputies, elected in another era, can no longer appeal to "the will of the people." The referendum has shown that neither Russia nor its people are now the same as they used to be.

IZVESTIYA Gives Preliminary Results of Vote

PM2604144593 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 27 Apr 93 First Edition p 2

[Moscow City Soviet Press Service report: "Preliminary Voting Results for Moscow District 25 April 1993"]

[Text] Total registered voters: 6,882,852.

Total turnout: 4,415,113.

Question No. 1

Total vote: 4,384,699.
Percentage of those registered to vote: 63.7.
Percentage of turnout: 99.3.
"For": 75.3 percent of those who voted.
"Against": 23.3 percent of those who voted.

Question No. 2

Total vote: 4,369,856.
Percentage of those registered to vote: 63.5.
Percentage of turnout: 99.0.
"For": 70.1 percent of those who voted.
"Against": 28.2 percent of those who voted.

Question No. 3

Total vote: 4,364,831.
Percentage of those registered to vote: 63.4.
Percentage of turnout: 98.9.
"For": 20.8 percent of those registered to vote.
"Against": 40.6 percent of those registered to vote.

Question No. 4

Total vote: 4,378,632.
Percentage of those registered to vote: 63.6.
Percentage of turnout: 99.2.
"For": 51.1 percent of those registered to vote.
"Against": 11.2 percent of those registered to vote.

Cites Voting Figures

PM2604155493 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 27 Apr 93 First Edition pp 1, 2

[Georgiy Melikyants roundup of reports by IZVESTIYA correspondents and agencies: "Preliminary Results of Voting"]

[Text] Buryat-Aginskiy District was the first to report preliminary (unofficial, of course) results of voting to the Central Electoral Commission: 74 percent of those on the roll took part in the referendum.

Nobody Was Expecting 99 Percent

In Moscow, an hour after voting ended, V. Afanasyev, secretary of the city commission for the all-Russia referendum, and A. Popov, Moscow City Soviet press secretary, also reported preliminary figures: In all 33 rayons of Moscow, 60.9 percent of the total number of citizens on the roll took part in the referendum.

In St. Petersburg, 56.76 percent of voters voted, while in Leningrad Oblast the figure was 56.2 percent. Voters in Sverdlovsk Oblast were quite active. In Yekaterinburg itself, 62.44 percent of voters had come to the polling places by 2000 hours.

In Tyumen, the picture was contradictory at first: Whereas in Aksark voting went steadily from early morning, and in Yalutorovsk it was neither fast nor slow, in Nadym it proceeded in fits and starts. The inhabitants were in no hurry, as if they were still thinking things over. But then they poured in. By 1800 hours nearly 60 percent of those on the roll had voted here. More than 60 percent of voters came to the polling places in Nizhniy Novgorod Oblast; Kamchatka; Altay Kray; Belgorod, Orenburg, Chita, Tambov, and Omsk Oblasts; and the cities of Zelenograd, Novocherkassk, and Taganrog. The leaders in terms of numbers voting in relation to the total number on the roll were Ryazan and Voronezh Oblasts—more than 70 percent.

There Were, However, Infringements

In Novomoskovsk, Tula Oblast, at one polling place only three ballot papers per person were issued. The voters were given this explanation: "The commission chairman has locked up the fourth, and he has left." This polling place had to be sealed off, Valentin Timonin, chief of the Central Electoral commission secretariat, told a RIA correspondent.

In Petersburg, in precinct 91 in Vyborgskiy Rayon, many ballot papers did not carry the signatures of members of the electoral commission or the official stamp. And the list held at precinct No. 488 even showed "dead souls"...

Just a few more examples of infringements in the course of voting. In the village of Bolshaya Labukha in Voronezh Oblast, two observers from the DPR [Democratic Party of Russia] were not allowed into the polling place. This was attributed to "instructions from above." In Voronezh itself, inhabitants found in their mail boxes, along with the newspapers, pamphlets showing illustrations of how to vote against the president. The Vologda motor vehicle inspectorate detained on the oblast boundary an official minibus bringing 19 sacks of antipresidential pamphlets from Yaroslavl, signed by a certain committee called "Reforms for the People." The cargo was delivered to the oblast administration and a report on the incident was sent to the prosecutor's office. In Yaroslavl Oblast at one polling place someone "voted" on behalf of an entire family who had left Yaroslavl long ago. The prosecutor's office is now looking into it.

A "vast number of falsifications and distortions" was announced in a statement by the Committee for the Defense of the Constitution and the Constitutional System, set up by the National Salvation Front, the "Russian Unity" parliamentary bloc, Zhirinovskiy's party, and the Officers Union. This statement will, of course, be investigated.

There were instances of unlawful campaigning on polling day. It is also distressing that too many ballot papers were judged invalid. Thus in Vladimir Oblast alone, INTERFAX reports, more than 109,000 were deemed invalid, or nearly 14 percent of the ballot papers issued.

Opinion of the Federation Republics

In Yakutsk, for instance, 61 percent of those on the roll voted. In Karelia it was 65 percent, and in Muyezerskiy and Belomorskiy Rayons more than 70 percent of inhabitants came to the polling places. Some 70 percent took part in voting in Mordovia and Chuvashia. A high percentage was observed in Bashkortostan and Kalmykia. But in Tatarstan no more than one-fourth of those entitled to vote turned out. And where Tatarstan President M. Shaymiyev comes from—Aktanyshskiy

Rayon—fewer than 10 people came to the polling places... Representatives of different political forces explain this in different ways: Some say that on Tatarstan's territory the referendum was taking place, so to speak, unofficially; others that people were afraid to express themselves openly, because lists of those turning out were being recorded...

In Nearby and Distant Foreign Parts

In Tallinn, apparently, some 7,000 people entitled to vote did so, and in Narva—3,000. Given that there are 30,000 Russian citizens in Estonia, only one in three of them voted...

In Yerevan, Russian diplomats and servicemen came to the polling places, as well as construction workers who are helping to restore the earthquake zone. Russia's embassy building in Moldova was packed. More than half of the Russian voters took part in the voting in Ashgabat.

In Ukraine, just one polling place was open—at the Russian Federation Embassy in Kiev. But people came from Poltava, Donbass, and other oblasts. Citizens of Russia living in the Baltic countries, Uzbekistan, and Tajikistan also exercised their right to vote in the All-Russian Referendum.

Voting was also fairly active at Russia's diplomatic missions in distant foreign countries. In Bonn, all the artists of the "Sovremennik" theater who are over there turned out to vote. In China, of 795 Russian adults who live in Beijing and neighboring cities, 777 took part in the referendum. But none of the throngs of "shuttle" workers who drop in and out of the Chinese capital called in at the embassy...

Talking Percentages

The final results of the referendum will be reported, as is known, at the beginning of May. But the agencies and the press are citing preliminary figures. In Moscow, according to Aleksandr Muzykantskiy, member of the city's district electoral commission, 68-70 percent approve the president's policy. In Petersburg, 72 and 66 percent of voters respectively voted "yes" to the first and second questions. On the third and fourth questions, 22 and 50 percent said "yes." In Yekaterinburg, some 85 percent came out in support of the president, although criticism of the president's actions was relatively strong here. The people of Volgograd who came to the polling places expressed confidence in the president (by two-thirds of the votes), as did the same number of people in Nizhniy Novgorod. Contrary to predictions by the president's opponents, in Tula 64 percent of voters said "yes" to him. The Rostov-na-Donu result is noteworthy: On the first question, 72 percent said "yes." But the majority of those who voted in Orenburg, Kursk, and Amur Oblasts said "no" to the president.

Yeltsin Said Studying Referendum Results

LD2604123893 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1302 GMT 26 Apr 93

[Text] Moscow, 26 Apr (ITAR-TASS)—According to Boris Yeltsin's press secretary Vyacheslav Kostikov, the Russian president is studying the provisional results of the voting as they come in from the regions. The president will give his assessment of the political results of the referendum and announce his plan of action based on that assessment once he has done the necessary analysis and held consultations on the final results of the referendum, Vyacheslav Kostikov noted.

He quoted Boris Yeltsin as saying: "The referendum proved valid thanks to the patriotic realization by the Russian public of the importance of the issues submitted to the referendum. The attempt by the Supreme Soviet leadership to wreck the nationwide vote, on the pretext that the public is tired of politics, has failed. Their attempt to discredit the wishes of the people will also fail."

Official Reaction to Voting, Results

Rutskoy Speaks With Journalists

LD2504133393 Moscow Ostankino Television First Channel Network in Russian 1100 GMT 25 Apr 93

[By correspondent Marianna Maksimovskaya; from the "Novosti" newscast]

[Text] Unlike the Russian president who arrived at his polling station long before virtually any journalists did, the vice president made the press wait. At 0835 GMT, according to assurances from some well-informed people, he was still drinking tea at home. On the other hand, Nikolay Ryzkhov and General Sterlikov voted at the same polling station before 0800 GMT. Each of them was willing to give their point of view on the development of the situation following the referendum.

[Begin recording] [Ryzhkov] There will be a fight whatever.

[Sterlikov] I think that if there are elections in autumn or spring, the national forces will win. [end recording]

Aleksandr Rutskoy arrived by 0900 GMT. The vice president did not disappoint the waiting journalists and talked with them for a long time.

[Begin recording] [Unidentified correspondent] Will you resign if Yeltsin receives a majority?

[Rutskoy, laughing] Do you want me to resign? What shall I say. Let us look at the referendum results and then we shall see. [end recording]

To Reveal Facts on Corruption

LD2504223493 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1900 GMT 25 Apr 93

[Text] Today, there is a real possibility of emerging from the deadlock only if we vote yes on the two last questions, stated Aleksandr Rutskoy, in an interview to RIA at the polling station. The vice president also revealed that he intends to appear on television and to cite concrete facts that will give evidence of corruption by the highest state officials in the country.

At the same time, he did not exclude the possibility of the president reaching a decision after the referendum to dismiss him from the post of chairman of the interdepartmental commission for combatting organized crime and corruption.

As to the draft constitution that the president had prepared, Aleksandr Rutskoy stated: I do not understand altogether what it is. According to him, the main provisions of the Constitution, which must be prepared by the constitutional commission, ought to be approved by the parliament.

Zorkin on 'Legal Consequences'

LD2504114393 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 1000 GMT 25 Apr 93

[By correspondent M. Sarbaa; from the "Vesti" newscast]

[Text] Constitutional Court Chairman Valeriy Zorkin voted at the place of his residence today, at polling station no. 62 in Kuntsevo in the capital. To journalists' questions as to what he voted for, he said:

[Begin Zorkin recording] I voted right. [end recording]

Noting the importance of the referendum, however, the guard of the constitutional order said:

[Begin Zorkin recording] It probably affects the mood of the citizen in some way, but it does not entail legal consequences. Depending on the result, a lot of things will follow. I hope that, if the result of the vote is unclear or the parties start arguing as regards the consequences, we should do what has been outlined already: early elections. [end recording]

Comments on Voting

LD2504154793 Moscow Ostankino Television First Channel Network in Russian 1100 GMT 25 Apr 93

[Interview with Valeriy Zorkin, chairman of the Constitutional Court, by Ivan Pankov outside polling station no. 62 in Kuntsevskiy rayon, Moscow on 25 April; from the "Novosti" newscast—recorded]

[Text] [Pankov] Did you hesitate at all about coming out to vote in the referendum?

[Zorkin] No, there was no hesitation today. It is a lovely day. I wanted to say the truth.

[Pankov] Was your family unanimous? Did you discuss it? Or does each decide in his own way?

[Zorkin] I do not foist my views on anyone. I do not dictate to others either at home or in court.

[Pankov] It will take about 10 days to count the votes. Will these days be more calm and will everything be settled or will passions intensify?

[Zorkin] This will all depend on the citizens of Russia, you know. Everyone is fed up with all these passions. People want the economy to be extricated at last from catastrophe and we have to act in this direction, but we have to act by the Constitution and by the law.

Supports 'Law-Governed' Parliament, Court

LD2504121793 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1201 GMT 25 Apr 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent]

[Text] Moscow April 25 TASS—"I support the popularly elected president of Russia, a law-governed parliament and a law-governed court," Chief Justice of the Constitutional Court Valeriy Zorkin told journalists at a polling station in the capital's Krylatskoye District on Sunday [25 April].

Zorkin believes that the referendum will not dot all the i's. In order to take the strain off the situation in the country, only two versions of actions are possible. The first version is for the president and parliament to remain in office until the end of their term, with the two sides agreeing that it is necessary to live according to the constitution, he said.

The second version means early elections, Zorkin said. "All other possible solutions would lead to a break-up and ruin of Russia," he emphasised. In his view, all principles that are necessary for a steady societal life are inherent in the current constitution: The principle of federalism, human rights and the division of powers.

The chief justice of the Constitutional Court is of the opinion that "the expression of confidence in the president will not mean an approval of the text of a new constitution which no one has seen yet".

Zorkin declined to disclose how he voted on the referendum questions. He voiced confidence that during the referendum the people would tell the authorities the truth about their attitude to them.

Khasbulatov, Others Comment

LD2504140593 Moscow Ostankino Television First Channel Network in Russian 1100 GMT 25 Apr 93

[Video report by Marianna Maksimovskaya; from the "Novosti" newcast]

[Text] Finding themselves without a job at the polling station where President Boris Yeltsin voted, the army of journalists headed for the House of Architects. Here they waited for Ruslan Khasbulatov.

[Begin recording] [Unidentified correspondent] What will happen tomorrow?

[Khasbulatov] Nothing awful will happen tommorrow. I am hoping for good weather tomorrow. [end recording]

The former head of the Soviet Union's government Valentin Pavlov and the former CPSU Central Committee Secretary Oleg Baklanov, taking part in the SCSE trial, voted at the same polling station. It so happened that for a long time they could not find the surname of Pavlov in the electoral roll. This is not surprising either. Russians have a habit of finding it easy to part with those who were once at the apex of power.

Sees No 'Catastrophic Changes'

LD2504080293 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 0737 GMT 25 Apr 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Tamara Ivanova]

[Text] Moscow, 25 Apr—Russian Supreme Soviet Chairman Ruslan Khasbulatov does not foresee catastrophic changes in the country's life after the referendum. At 1000 [0600 GMT] he took part in the voting at the polling station installed in the Central House of the Architect in Moscow. The head of parliament naturally refused to tell journalists what answers he gave to the referendum questions. He stated that the future depends on the will of the people today, having stressed that steadiness, stability, and adherence to the Constitution and the laws are a pledge of calm.

Ruslan Khasbulatov thinks that there should not be any free interpretations of the results of the referendum. Having recalled the verdict of the Constitutional Court with regard to the questions on confidence in the president and his policies, the head of parliament said that "even if 100 percent vote for the president, he does not have the right to effect constitutional changes uniltertally."

The head of parliament expressed concern over possible breaches of the procedure for holding the referendum and mentioned cases of forged ballots in the Far East. According to him, in this connection electoral commissions should increase their supervision of the plebiscite.

Comments on Vote Counting

LD2604135193 Moscow Mayak Radio Network in Russian 1230 GMT 26 Apr 93

[Excerpts] The preliminary results of the referendum in Moscow have been totalled. [passage omitted]

Over 51 percent of the Muscovites on the electoral roll said yes to the fourth question about early elections of the deputies' corps.

I must note that at a session of the presidium of the Supreme Soviet today—I was present there—Ruslan Khasbulatov said that the totalling of votes on this question should not be made on the basis of the number of voters who voted but according to the number of eligible voters.

Chernomyrdin Against Coalition Government

LD2504092193 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 0825 GMT 25 Apr 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Ivan Ivanov]

[Text] Moscow, 25 Apr—Viktor Chernomyrdin, chairman of the Russian Federation Council of Ministers, told journalists this morning while voting at a referendum polling station that the government "is ready to cooperate with all parties and experts on a professional level," with those "who want the reforms in our country to continue and the country to develop in a civilized manner." Right now, he said, "we are simply not prepared to create a coalition government." In his view, in the country now "there are no political forces or parties capable of forming such a coalition."

Answering a question from an ITAR-TASS correspondent about how he voted, Viktor Chernomyrdin said he said "yes" to the questions about confidence in the president and the policy of reforms. "I think that it would be premature right now to elect a new president," the prime minister said commenting on his response to the third referendum question and added that he said "yes" to the question on early elections for Russia's people's deputies. The head of the Russian cabinet voted at polling station no. 6 Stavropolskiy rayon in Moscow, the polling station for his place of residence.

In a conversation with journalists, Viktor Chernomyrdin said that he is in favor of stability in Russia. "We already passed a critical point in the reforms and now we should organize work. For this we need the president, strong power, and order," he noted, repeating that "without stability it will be difficult for us to overcome the current situation."

Replying to a question regarding Khasbulatov's statement yesterday that the government as it were is an obstacle for implementing the reforms, Viktor Chernomyrdin said: "I think if Ruslan Khasbulatov knew what the government is doing at present he would not make such statements."

Kostikov Says Yeltsin 'Pleased'

LD2604153293 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1311 GMT 26 Apr 93

[Telephone interview with Presidential Press Secretary Vyacheslav Kostikov by unidentified Radio Rossii announcer in Moscow—live]

[Text] [Announcer] An hour ago, Ruslan Imranovich Khasbulatov spoke on our program. In the news bulletin, I heard a brief reference to the statement by Vyacheslav Kostikov, the Russian Federation president's press secretary, on the referendum. I decided to phone him directly from the studio. I did, indeed, get through, and now Vyacheslav Vasilyevich Kostikov is on the line.

May we have your assessment of the political results of the referendum, or whatever you have to say on the subject. Good day, Vyacheslav Vasilyevich.

[Kostikov] Good day! Hello, dear radio listeners of Russia! We are getting a huge number of telephone calls today. People who voted in the referendum yesterday—ordinary voters and journalists, and chief editors of newspapers—are naturally asking, are telephoning to ask, how the president is reacting to the results of the referendum. I should say that it is still a bit too early to speak about the final results of the referendum, given that information from the regions is still coming in.

On the basis of the preliminary results, however, one can already talk about some political aspects. In particular, first thing this morning—when Boris Nikolayevich came to the Kremlin—I chatted with him and asked what his personal assessment was. For the moment, he is avoiding talking about the referendum results, but he said he was very pleased with the way that Russian Federation citizens had turned out en masse for the referendum.

One can probably say that the president thanks the people of Russia for responding so unanimously to his call to turn out and decide the destiny of Russia. The president said that the referendum had taken place because of the patriotic understanding of the population of Russia and the importance of the questions that were put forward at the referendum—despite the fact that the leaders of the Supreme Soviet did everything possible to wreck the nationwide expression of its will on the pretext that the population is weary of politics.

These attempts failed, and the attempt to discredit the will of the people will not succeed either, Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin said. At the moment, the president is very carefully studying the results that are coming in—the preliminary results of the voting—as they come in from the regions. As for an assessment of the political results of this nationwide vote and the president's plan of action following these assessments, after Boris Nikolayevich has made the necessary thorough analysis of the results and has had political consultations on the final results of the referendum, then we shall find out what the president can do, and what he wants to do—resting upon the support that the Russian Federation citizens have so clearly given him. If Russia's Radio has another minute or so?

[Announcer] Go ahead!

[Kostikov] I would like to express my opinion about the statement made by Supreme Soviet Speaker Khasbulatov, alleging that the referendum has made a split in society. It seems to me—this is my personal opinion here—that this is essentially evidence of Khasbulatov's lack of respect for the will of the people and the patriotic position of the Russian people. The mass support that Russian Federation citizens have shown for the president and his policy is evidence of something quite different, of the fact that Russia has been reborn and that the nationwide will for our country's rebirth through democratic reform and democratic transformations is becoming stronger.

The referendum demonstrated not a split in society, but a consolidation of a broad strata around the president's policy and around the government's ideals of the new, great, and free Russia that Yeltsin is proposing. He is proposing this, not only in the interests of democrats—of those people who voted for the president and in support of him—but also in the interests of all citizens of the Russian Federation, regardless of their political convictions.

I would like merely to remind our dear citizens of the Russian Federation, the radio listeners, that the president was elected as the president of the whole country, of all Russian Federation citizens. That is how he always regards himself. Therefore, it is from this point of view that one must assess the results of the referendum.

As for the nervous, hasty opinions that Khasbulatov expressed at the session of the Supreme Soviet Presidium today, I think his attempt to discredit the outcome of the referendum, even before the final results have been collated, demonstrates that the conservative leadership of the Supreme Soviet is increasingly losing touch with political realities. In general, I have the impression that Russia has started moving forward—maybe with difficulty, but along a wide road, even if it is not always smooth and well-trodden—while the Supreme Soviet is constantly trying to walk along the edge. I would simply like to warn the Russian people about a certain risk. It is the risk that the leadership of the Supreme Soviet—as they lose the ground under their feet and any support among the general public—may, and probably will, push the deputies—and this was actually talked about at the meeting of the Supreme Soviet Presidium today—toward certain ill-considered, aggressive actions.

In particular, they are very irritated by the stance adopted by the Russian press and journalists with regard to the president and the referendum. I think an attempt will now be made to take revenge on the free, democratic Russian press for that position of support. I fear that they may manage to do damage to Russian democracy and to the Russian people's right to freedom of information and freedom of speech. For this reason, we—the democratic public and press—must under no circumstances get carried away by euphoria. Rather, we must display the utmost vigilance, in order to be able, at the necessary moment, to block this attempt to usurp the fourth estate.

[Announcer] Thank you, Vyacheslav Vasilyevich, thank you.

Yemalyanov Warns Politicians

LD2604140493 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1241 GMT 26 Apr 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Tamara Zamyatina]

[Text] Moscow April 26 TASS—Member of the Russian Presidential Council Aleksey Yemelyanov has called on politicians to interpret the results of the referendum in the interests of the economy and social stability in the country.

Yemelyanov warned both sides—the leaders of the executive and the legislative branches of power—that "further heightening of passions" on the basis of the results of the national poll on confidence in the president and his policy could be dangerous.

Yemelyanov, speaking ahead of the summarizing of final results of the plebiscite, expressed confidence that "the president will use sensibly the support given him by the citizens of Russia" if the result of voting confirm confidence in him.

This support must be used not for "launching an offensive against the representative power but for solving specific problems on which Russia's life depends", Yemelyanov said.

He said that economic reform must be modified to strengthen its community orientation, stimulate and stabilize production.

According to Yemelyanov, who is also a member of the parliament and of the Russian Academy of Sciences, the economy needs better state regulation of its key positions during transition to the market.

Yemelyanov thought it advisable to make decisions on a clear-cut division of functions between the branches of power and on strengthening state power as such. Moreover, he called on "people in power to promise only what can be effectively realized".

Aleksey Yemelyanov warned politicians against ill-considered conclusions and statements connected with the outcome of the referendum in order to avoid "rocking ever more the state boat which is quite unstable as it is".

As concerns the parliament and the entire Deputies' Corps, Yemelyanov said that people's deputies will have to curb their immoderate ambitions and "show respect for the will of the people regardless of whether they like or dislike the results of the referendum".

Shakhray, Poltoranin, Burbulis Interviewed

LD2504230593

[Editorial Report] Moscow Ostankino Television First Channel Network in Russian and TV-6 Moscow at 2150 GMT on 25 April carry a live linkup of a special "TV marathon" on the results of the referendum. Announcer Eduard Sagalayev states that the marathon is drawing to a close, apologizes for some failures that they have had in covering the referendum, and hands over to a recent video report from the Kremlin.

The TV-6 film crew has recorded some interviews from the Kremlin itself: Sergey Shakhray is asked to forecast the outcome, and says: "The commission will tell." Asked about his personal expectations, he says he expects "positive results." He is asked: "What do you mean by positive results?" Shakhray replies: "It's as the song has it: yes, yes, no, yes [reference to campaign song, which gives instructions on how to answer the four questions]. Or, putting it more simply: what is needed is confidence in the president, confidence in the government, and early election of deputies. This is the only peaceful way out of the crisis."

Mikhail Poltoranin is then asked about his opinion. Poltoranin replies: "My opinion is exactly the same. There is only one thing I'd like to add. Our opponents, if one can call them that, preferred the referendum not to have taken place. But it has, and it is now over, and even if the results were half and half, this would mean that all branches of power have to stand for election. I would like this new election to give us a completely new power, intelligent and normal people who would be able to be responsible for the future of Russia."

Gennadiy Burbulis is then asked if he often has to spend all night working in the Kremlin. Burbulis replies: "There have been many such occasions. It seems to me that we have seen that by means of healthy political logic we can find the way out of the blind alley. The achievement of 25 April is that the the Russian electorate has taken upon itself to resolve the prolonged political struggle between the highest power structures. It is already clear now that the outcome of today's referendum gives the president the necessary legal basis to use his political will and purposefully press for two things Russia needs, i.e. early elections and a new Constitution. We now have this chance, and we're going to use it, together with the electorate."

He is then asked: "Do you think this day will go down in history?" Burbulis says: "This depends on what happens tomorrow and the day after."

Concluding the day's marathon, Sagalayev then goes back to TV-6 correspondent Sergey Dorenko, who comes up live with the latest results on polling in the capital, over graphs:

Dorenko says: "We have, in fact, information that allows us to draw preliminary conclusions on the results of the voting in both capitals. This very minute, we have only Zelenograd's results [Moscow's major industrial satellite]. Zelenograd is a district of Moscow. In this district, 78 percent are for the president, 73 percent of the turnout are for the reform, 20 percent of the roll are for early presidential election, and 60 percent of the electoral roll are for early parliamentary elections.

"Now, St. Petersburg, here we have a random selection of results from different districts of the city. These reflect possibly, or they may not—we will find this out later—the general situation in the city. About 70 percent are for the president, just under 50 percent are for reform, just under 35 percent—not of the roll, however, are for the early presidential election and 60-80 percent of the turnout are for early parliamentary elections.

"Now, to look beyond capitals—such a vast region as Kamchatka—though not very heavily populated: 71 percent are for the president, 62 percent are for reform, 24 percent of the roll are for early presidential election, and 45 percent of the roll are for early parliamentary elections."

Dorenko then gives credit to all agencies that have assisted him in his work: Ekho Moskvy, INTERFAX, Ostankino OTV1, and ITAR-TASS.

Sagalayev thanks all those involved in the organization of the marathon—the first event of its kind on TV-6, and gives the opinion of all reporters and journalists who are covering the event: "The position of us, those who work on television, is not pro- Yeltsin or pro-Khasbulatov, pro-president or pro-parliament. This is the position of people who wish well to their viewers, to their audiences. This will guide us in all our work."

Commentary Views Yeltsin's 'Moral' Victory

LD2604133993 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1000 GMT 26 Apr 93

[Commentary by Russian Television political observer Nikolay Svanidze]

[Text] And so, the main event in the country's political life for the recent period has taken place. We shall see very soon whether this will help to extricate us from the crisis in which the present authorities have found themselves and whether it will ensure that the citizens of the Russian Federation can raise their standard of well-being.

Today, at least, one can say with absolute certainty that Russia has cast its vote. The fears that the people had lost faith in politics and had given it all up as a bad job, and that this would impede the proceedings, turned out to be unjustified. That is the first result of the referendum—and the only indisputable one.

Nikolay Svanidze, political observer of Russian Television and Radio, reflects upon the other results.

[Svanidze] Each of the opposing sides will be trying to interpret the rest of the results in their own way, but there can be no comment on the civic responsibility demonstrated by the population; one can only accept it. The results of the referendum became pretty obvious even before 25 April. They were, in effect, determined by the Constitutional Court's elegant decision on counting the votes. Of course, there will be a yes to the first question on confidence in the president and a no to the third. Those who express confidence in the president are hardly likely to want him to stand for election—that much is clear.

As for agreement with his policy, that is another matter. Whoever might implement it, whoever might impede it, and whatever hopes we may link with it in the future, Russian citizens vacillate in their attitude toward the economic situation in the country today. However, strange as it may seem, it is highly likely that faith in Yeltsin and the disappearance of the concept of shortages will compel the majority of citizens of Russia to approve the economic strategy of the president, despite inflation.

The fourth question, regarding parliamentary elections, also raises difficulties. The majority who voted will doubtless call for elections. However, it is unlikely that there will be half of the electoral roll, that is, half of the total number of voters. So the most likely thing is that the referendum will officially end up either with a count of two each—two answers for the president and two for his opponents—or three to one in Yeltsin's favor.

In both cases, the result of the plebiscite gives Yeltsin the indisputable moral right to regard himself the winner. The first question is the key one: a sure yes on this point is indicative of confidence in him and enables Yeltsin to confirm that, through nearly 18 months of dramatic trials, he has not lost the mandate to carry out radical reforms.

The successful call to the people over the head of the Congress gives Yeltsin the unique possibility to break out of the tenacious embrace of the deputies and to seize the initiative again. In the resulting situation, the Congress loses any real opportunity to carry out the most radical step in the struggle with the president, namely impeachment. While seeking other effective means, it will be compelled to go onto the defensive. However, the president can develop and realize his success in one case only: if he can manage to get a new Constitution adopted, one which will make the all- powerful Congress a part of history, ensure the real division of powers, and untie the government's hands.

International Community Reacts to Outcome

Japan Welcomes Yeltsin's 'Victory'

LD2604111893 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1059 GMT 26 Apr 93

[By ITAR-TASS]

[Text] Tokyo April 26 TASS—Japanese Prime Minister Kiichi Miyazawa welcomed Boris Yeltsin's obvious victory in the national referendum on confidence in him and his reform policy which was held on Sunday [25 April]. Responding to questions of reporters in his Tokyo residence, the head of the Japanese Government said that the Russian people voted above all in favour of reforms and democratization of the country.

Commenting on the first results of the referendum, General Secretary of the Japanese Cabinet of Ministers Yohei Kono told a news conference in Tokyo that preparations for President Boris Yeltsin's official visit to Japan must be speeded up.

The Japanese Foreign Ministry believes that the results of the referendum in favour of Yeltsin would help create a favourable atmosphere for the Russian president's visit to Tokyo, according to NHK Television. Sources in the Japanese Foreign Ministry said the results of the Sunday voting would provide a stimulus for more resolute implementation of democratic and market reforms in Russia.

Practically all Japanese newspapers expressed hope that more than one half of all the voters supported Yeltsin. According to express surveys conducted by most Japanese newspapers at Moscow polling stations, approximately 60-70 per cent of the voters there cast their ballots in favour of the president.

Analyzing the reaction in Japan to the results of the Russian referendum the newspaper MAINICHI said "the Japanese Government sees the situation as a vote of confidence in the President Boris Yeltsin.

Britain, Germany Welcome Results

LD2604112993 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1110 GMT 26 Apr 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Vladimir Voronkov]

[Text] London April 26 [dateline as received]—Preliminary results of the referendum in Russia show that the people support the policy of democracy and reform conducted by President Yeltsin, British Prime Minister John Major said. Speaking at a meeting of the Board of Directors of the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD) in London today, Major said the Russian leader enjoys general support, since it serves the interests of all countries.

The referendum results show that Russia will continue to move along the path of democratic reform, German Finance Minister Theo Waigel, chairman of the Board of Directors of the EBRD, said.

German Minister Comments

LD2604130493 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1212 GMT 26 Apr 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Gennadiy Temnenkov]

[Text] Bonn April 26 TASS—German Foreign Minister Klaus Kinkel has welcomed provisional results of a nationwide referendum held in Russia on Sunday [25 April], which showed that a majority of electors participating in the vote had expressed their support of President Boris Yeltsin and his policy of reforms. In an interview with "Deutchlandfunk" Radio today, Kinkel said that these tendencies were "encouraging" and fully met the aspirations of the G-7 countries, Europeans and Germany.

Kinkel pointed out the Russian people's active participation in the referendum, adding that the president had received more support than expected.

German Finance Minister Theodor Waigel was satisfied with the results of the referendum as well. He declared in Bonn today that the course to democratization and a policy of economic reforms had received further support in Russia. Waigel said that now it is possible to come down to the quick implementation of a resolution on aid to Russia, recently adopted by the G-7 countries in Tokyo. Any defeat of the course, pursued by the democratically elected Russian president, would do considerable political and economic damage to Western countries, Waigel said.

Political Issues

Yeltsin Strips Rutskoy of Land Reform Task

LD2504142393 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1340 GMT 25 Apr 93

[Text] Moscow, 25 Apr (ITAR-TASS)—Russian President Boris Yeltsin, by a decree of 23 April of this year, has rescinded his decree of 26 February 1992 "on the responsibilities and powers of the vice president of the Russian Federation," in which Vice President Aleksandr Rutskoy was put in charge of implementing land and agro-industrial reform and work on solving the problems of agriculture and food production. The new decree also declares the decree of 27 June 1992 "on organizational measures for the implementation of land and agro-industrial reform in the Russian Federation" to be no longer in force in relation to the "establishment of the rights and obligations of the vice president of the Russian Federation" in this sphere. Boris Yeltsin based the decree of 23 April on "the introduction of the post of deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers—government—of the Russian Federation responsible for the development of the agro-industrial complex."

'Obligatory Checks' To Be Run on Top Officials

LD2404100493 Moscow Ostankino Television First Channel Network in Russian 2000 GMT 23 Apr 93

[From the "Novosti" newscast]

[Text] According to the president's spokesman, a decision is being prepared on obligatory checks of people appointed to supreme state bodies. It looks as if the authorities are alarmed by the statements of some figures in the extreme opposition that they have their own people in the Kremlin who are just waiting for a signal.

Yeltsin Introduction to Draft Constitution Published

PM2304170993 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 24 Apr 93 First Edition p 1

[Statement issued by President Boris Yeltsin; place and date not given: "On the Eve of the Referendum President Has Published Main Provisions of New Constitution"—first paragraph is IZVESTIYA introduction]

[Text] The Russian Federation president is going to acquaint us with the basic principles of the new Russian Federation Constitution. The full text of the Constitution has recently been sent to the leaders of republics, krays, oblasts, the autonomous oblast, and the cities of Moscow and St. Petersburg, and it will subsequently be published.

On the eve of the all-Russian referendum on 25 April, I, as president of the Russian Federation, submit to the people the draft of a new Russian Constitution which has been the result of painstaking work to combine the best points in the drafts put forward by the Constitutional Commission, the Russian Federation president, and a number of action groups. The proposed draft is, on the one hand, the fruit of lengthy collective work, and on the other, the principled position of the president.

Why do I consider it important to publish the basic provisions of this draft on the eve of such an important state event?

It seems to me that the vote of confidence in the president is not a vote for some abstract bright future, but for specific legal guarantees, civil rights, and the values of any individual who bears the lofty title of citizen of the Russian Federation. We should rid ourselves of the logic of confrontation and destruction, and continue to undertake constructive work to build our common state home and a new political and legal system. This construction is only possible using civilized means and on the basis of constitutional principles which should be established by the Russian Federation people themselves.

It cannot be otherwise, because **the Constitution** is the state's legal identity card. **The Constitution** is the Basic Law of development of a multinational, federal, and democratic Russia. **The Constitution** is our civil choice in favor of **Democracy and Federalism.** It is our free will and conscious opportunity to say "YES" to human rights, democracy, and effective state power. It is our resolute "NO" to ideological tunnel vision, monopoly on the truth, illegal thuggery, and administrative chaos.

In submitting this draft Russian Federation Constitution, I am proposing my own blueprint for the future development of our federal state, my own vision of the future of multinational Russia, and my own idea of the civilized, full-blooded, and free future of every Russian citizen. And all the Russian Federation's peoples and nationalities should take part in this work, all its political and social forces, and every individual person who has linked his future to that of the Russian Federation.

This is why I am appealing to you, dear compatriots, and I hope to find understanding and assistance from you in this difficult common state matter which is so important for all of us.

The basis of the draft Russian Federation Constitution proposed by the president is formed by **seven immutable principles,** upon which no organ or official, however lofty the power he possesses, is henceforth entitled to encroach. Only the Russian PEOPLE should be entitled to establish these principles, only the Russian PEOPLE are entitled once and for all to make their historic choice, and only the Russian PEOPLE can change it.

Supreme Soviet Chairman on Referendum, Other Issues

LD2404165893 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 1105 GMT 24 Apr 93

[Interview with Supreme Soviet Chairman Ruslan Khasbulatov by Yevgeniy Tolstykh in the studio in Moscow—live]

[Excerpts] [Tolstykh] Good day, esteemed viewers. We have Supreme Soviet Chairman Ruslan Imranovich Khasbulatov in our studio today. We are live on the air, but we do not have a direct telephone link in as we usually do on such occasions. This may upset many people, but do not be upset. I will try to put to the head of our parliament the questions that make up a sum total of the people's doubts on the eve of the referendum.

Tomorrow we—I almost said all as one, as in the old days—will go to the ballot box to cast our votes and to express our free will. Numerous posters and the most varied propaganda leaflets in all towns and villages are calling on us to do this. I have brought one of the propaganda leaflets here. Have a look, Ruslan Imranovich. Some of them are in writing, in a printed form. But there is also the option of expressing one's free will in a musical form, using the motive of a famous song: "Even a Stump on a Spring Day."

You know, the motive becomes rather obtrusive because both in writing and orally the same thing is being proposed: for the president, for the reforms, and against the deputies, or else. And conclusions follow. Kyrgyzstan President Akayev in an interview with Japanese Television yesterday said: If Yeltsin loses, the pro-communist parliament will begin the restoration of the former empire, and this will inevitably lead to war.

Take an ordinary voter, a peaceful and perhaps a family man. He asks himself: Why should I want war? I would rather have the president. I am for the president. And he is right; Richard Layard, adviser to the Russian Government and a professor at the London School of Economics, approves of his decision. Progress will be possible if Yeltsin convincingly wins the referendum, and this will give him a mandate to pursue a tough credit policy which, in its turn, will lead to the bankruptcy of enterprises and unemployment. Our ordinary voter scratches his head again: on the one hand, war; on the other, unemployment. But no, the not unknown Yelena Bonner comforts him in an interview with "Voice of America."

The question is how to refrain from resolving the problems by violence. The ordinary voter thinks: What will happen if they do not refrain? What is it? No matter what yes or no you cross out, war is inevitable.

Now, if we leave my perhaps ironic introduction, may I ask you: Is this a reality or is this an ideology of intimidating people, taken advantage of just on the eve of the people expressing their will?

[Khasbulatov] Unfortunately, you were absolutely right when you mentioned these words and the term intimidation. Of course, there is no question of any kind of enormous catastrophe ensuing in our country after 25 April. No, not in any event. Also this cannot happen for a very simple reason. The point is that the institution itself, the referendum itself, has practically been rendered valueless by the Constitutional Court decision.

I would like to remind the esteemed TV viewers of the fact that Boris Nikolayevich wanted to put this question—whether you have confidence in the president or not—a long time ago, you will recall, as long ago as the Seventh Congress. Finally—let's not go back in history, we do not have so much time for our conversation in front of our TV viewers on the eve of the referendum—the Ninth Congress agreed to put forward this question.

Of course, this is not a matter of the president asking for his activities in a game of tennis or some other unimportant matter to be approved or not approved. As far as we understand it, and as far I understand it, it is a matter of this: If the majority of the electorate on the electoral role give their agreement and approve his activities, the president intended and intends to implement and propose to implement very serious constitutional changes. This is the sense of this referendum which the president insisted on.

So the recent decision by the Constitutional Court consists of the fact that, in accordance with that decision by the Constitutional Court, the status of the referendum is transferred to the category of being consultative. That is, this question is not a constitutional question, therefore it is consultative, deliberative. It is a kind of poll; it is equal to a run-of-the-mill poll. That was the only question that the president insisted on. He was not interested in the second, the third, or the fourth.

Incidentally, I and my deputy chairmen of the Supreme Soviet were also in favor. The president asked: Let's have the possibility of asking this one question. Why? Because this question embodies what is formulated in the second question, the question about social and economic policy. Right? And in the third question, the fourth, and so on. Therefore, of course, all the other questions are of a secondary nature, ever more so since the majority of deputies—and I, in particular—have long been a supporter of us, along with the president, standing for reelection, taking into account the fact that we have made some very serious mistakes.

So I would like to inform the people in order to prevent misunderstandings during voting and to escape the stream of lies that is being implanted in people's brains every day. If the president does not get an absolute majority....[pauses] at any rate, over 53 million votes, and even in this case the court recognized that it would be impossible to make constitutional changes because this is going to be a purely consultative poll. This is the point, and I do not quite understand why the press and television hush up this conclusion. But, nevertheless, I would like to be objective in this matter, and regardless of the conclusion of the Constitutional Court, if the majority of people on the electoral register approve the activities of the president—as far as I know we have 106 million people with the right to vote—the way I see it, if 53 million people approve the president's activities, I think he has a right to demand the introduction of very serious changes to the Constitution, incorporating his requirements, his recommendations, and his conditions. I think that in this case the Congress and the Supreme Soviet should most definitely reckon with it.

[Tolstykh] It is the will of the people, one cannot do anything about it.

[Khasbulatov] Yes, the will of the people. But if the second option takes place—if he gets a simple majority, the majority of those who attend the referendum, say, 25 or even 30 million people—if the president puts forward demands, based on this simple majority, saying: I am introducing a new constitution, I am disbanding the Congress, the Supreme Soviet, and I make constitutional decisions of this sort, I would like to say right away that those would be unconstitutional decisions. We will not allow him to deviate from the Constitution and legal requirements in this way.

In general, I would like to draw your attention to two details. I was a firm supporter of not holding the referendum because I thought it has been a very difficult year. A lot of mistakes have been made. We are facing serious problems. We do need to devote 1993 to a real economic reform and to improving people's conditions. I suggested that elections for both the president and people's deputies should be held some time in the spring. But the thing is that the president himself agreed to this several times. The subjects of our federation have tried to convince him of this, and a lot of other sober-thinking people. He would first agree, and then he would give in again under the pressure from certain people.

Why all this pressure? Why was this referendum necessary? I can assure you there was one and the only reason and that is that society's attention had to be distracted from the most serious social and economic situation.

Now let's ask the following question—has this strategic task been a success? Yes, it has. People are no longer talking about their bad conditions and so on and so forth.

You referred to the trustworthy sources as saying that the red-browns would come unless we support the referendum, and so on and so forth, so we all have to support something, but we still do not know what we have to support. So that hysteria was a success.

Now the second strategic task they are pursuing is the imposition of a new constitution with a liberal wrapping by unconstitutional means.

[Tolstykh] Can I say something Ruslan Imranovich?

[Khasbulatov] Yes, of course.

[Tolstykh] You say they—who do you mean: the president and his entourage, or...

[Khasbulatov, interrupting] I mean mainly his entourage, even more than Boris Nikolayevich himself. Those individuals who were already named, also named by the vice president. I would like to warn you that this second strategic task—to introduce a new draft constitution, adopt it unconstitutionally in the shortest possible space of time—will not be allowed to happen.

This is absolutely clear and precise, and naturally we must all ensure that the existing Constitution is observed exactly and precisely.

[Tolstykh] You know, serious analysts—and I do not have in mind people who are prone to euphoria when confronted with the sociological research of Professor Grushev, who always claims that the all-popular support for reforms, no matter what they are, exists—serious analysts say that no matter what the referendum results are, they are hardly likely to be of benefit to Russia.

[Khasbulatov] But of course not. I completely agree with you, I beg your pardon, I agree with you entirely. The point can only be that there will be a next stage in the weakening of our statehood.

[Tolstykh] My question was, as it were, a continuation of what you were saying. To say nothing of the autonomous entities which have already had their fill of their newly found sovereignty, resulting in an imbalance both in Russia's economy and its social sphere, even regions, such major ones as the Transural and Siberian....

[Khasbulatov, interrupting] And the central region. And the northwestern.

[Tolstykh] And the Central, all being separated from the center.

[Khasbulatov] They are distancing themselves.

[Tolstykh] Yes, this process is still in its infancy. They place different emphasis on this, saying that, yes, party apparatchiks became entrenched in the regions and that they want to set up separate principalities. Others say no, regions wish somehow to protect their population from this shock barrage of reforms. No matter what the situation is, it may generally lead to the most terrible thing of all: the disintegration of Russia. One more aspect here is the inculcation of some sort of soviet of the Federation in the public consciousness, which—I do beg your pardon if I am mistaken—reminds one a little of some sort of rehearsal of the second act of the Belovezh meeting.

[Khasbulatov] Well, that is Gorbachev's idea. Unfortunately, those people who Esteemed Boris Nikolayevich really does rely on, it has long been noted that there are not any people with a serious analytical ability, that there are not any strategic ideas which could suggest a way out of the economic crisis, the spiritual and cultural crisis. People are already fed up with the dissemination of that ersatz culture, that license. For two or three years now, in my opinion, everybody has had enough of it.

Take that propaganda—those Snickers, chocolate, those chocolate sweets in which a pot-bellied lad eats his fill—well, may God grant that pot-bellied lad a long life, but when millions of hungry children in a number of regions do not have such an opportunity, and when bread is a luxury in a number of regions, that is unfortunately....

[Tolstykh, interrupting] Bread is a basic food....

[Khasbulatov, interrupting] Yes, unfortunately that is how it is. It seems to me even immoral to show all that. In these conditions it is obvious that the presidential team lacks any serious approaches to resolving our problems and for some reason or other they do not want to work jointly with the Supreme Soviet. For instance, everybody's become addicted to that referendum, but I do not know—it is just shameful—the prime minister is busy with the referendum, to say nothing of Shumeyko dealing with the referendum. Everybody is busy with the referendum.

A few days ago a very terrible disaster occurred at the Kamaz works. Do you have any idea what the Kamaz works is? It is 80-percent trucks. Moreover, it took two years for the main engine workshop to be assembled, assembled using equipment bought worldwide. So where is the prime minister, where is Shumeyko, his first deputy, who should have worked night and day with teams of experts to get that workshop, that Kamaz workshop, operational again? Well, that is what I am talking about. That is why I am sounding the alarm.

Why are my associates in the Supreme Soviet and I sounding the alarm? It is because of the economy. They have proved quite incapable as far as economic reform is concerned. I want to say another thing. The main obstacle to economic reforms is the team of so-called reformers. They are now themselves the chief brake on the path of normal economic reforms. That is the turn that events have now taken. So there is no red-brown threat. It does not exist at all.

[Tolstykh] One could say that by now no one is taking this idea seriously. It has outlived itself. Just like the idea of a struggle between the Russians and the Kabardinians—I mean Chechens—or Yeltsin and Khasbulatov. This idea has also outlived itself.

[Khasbulatov] Just a minute. I would like to give an explanation for my compatriots. According to the Constitution, if the president is relieved of his duties, or is incapable of fulfilling them, or if he resigns voluntarily, the Constitution stipulates that the vice president becomes a provisional president. The Constitution also states that if the vice president cannot carry out the presidential duties for one reason or another, it is the federal head of government who becomes the president. What does Khasbulatov have to do with this? What do I really have to do with this? Everything is transformed into a personal issue.

By the way, you have just shown me this propaganda distributed through the mail. It is in millions of copies, and it appeals for general support. Well, this does not matter. The fact that Eldar Ryazanov and the football player Starostin have signed this does not matter either. But look, those so-called democrats are using some fascist tactics. Look at this slogan, and let the viewers see it as well: I have never believed them, my answer is yes, yes, no, yes. So you see, all these snakes, the octopus [referring to graphic on poster he is holding]....

[Tolstykh, interrupting] This represents the congress, as far as I understand it.

[Khasbulatov] Yes, it represents the congress. But I am talking about the history of this slogan. These are the thirties, when mass repression was going on. These are Kukryniksy [reference to group of political cartoonists in 1930's]. Look what sort of slogans the so-called democrats of present times are using.

And another thing: Now attempts are being made to link my name to some kind of Chechen mafia. I do not know why on earth my name should be linked to the Chechen mafia. I have already told, I believe, that I have lived only in two towns (?in Chechnya). I just about had time to be born in the Caucasus, as you know, and after that we had to move very far away. I had my residence permit in north Kazakhstan, then Alma-Ata, then Moscow. I have been living in Moscow for over 30 years! Moscow is now inundated with such slogans as "Chechens must go back to Groznyy," "Tatars to Kazan," "Jews to Israel," and so on. Again, this is something that is described as the democratic press. Do you see the signs of emerging fascism? This is a horrible tendency.

So tell me: Against the background of such slogans, what kind of democracy are we talking about? There is no trace of it. This is what I fear. This is frightening. Next—another consequence of this—why else was I against the referendum? I said: Boris Nikolayevich, this will drive a wedge into our society, it really will. You know, when I was talking yesterday to Nikolay Ilyich Travkin, who we all know, we spoke about the split that has taken place. He then pulled out his diary, an old, dog-eared one, and said: You are absolutely right. In this book I have my friends or good acquaintances. Now 50 percent of them have become my enemies.

Isn't this a tragedy? Just imagine....

[Tolstykh, interrupting] He should keep it! Things will change, and they will return as friends.

[Khasbulatov] Of course they will. But what is happening now is of the same hue as things that happened during the civil war.

[Tolstykh] Yes, when wedges were driven into a family, between a father and a son, or a brother.

[Khasbulatov] Yes, indeed. My relatives were also on both sides then, I remember this from their biographies. The same thing is happening today—what is more, it is under false pretenses, to give some people a chance to justify their actions, while some people really refuse to make any kind of sacrifice—especially in light of what Aleksandr Vladimirovich Rutskoy spoke about at the congress.

Some want to confuse the trail, and some simply are holding on to power and want to strengthen that power. They do not need a democratic constitution at all. They need a boundless lust for power. That is the crux of it. No control on the part of parliament; you want to control, so that means that you aspire to belong to the reds and browns. That is a primitive argument.

[Tolstykh] But the more primitive it is, the more easily it is assimilated, isn't it?

[Khasbulatov] Yes, unfortunately that is so....

[Tolstykh, interrupting] That was at the basis of Goebbels' propaganda: The more blatant the lie, the more readily it is accepted.

[Khasbulatov] But of course. Incidentally, that concerns you too. Quite frankly, I do not understand you. I understand that the president upped the salaries of television workers to 100,000 rubles recently....

[Tolstykh, interrupting] Show me such workers!

[Khasbulatov] Some, some, not all. I understand all that. But just listen, after all. Poltoranin—that ministry of lies, which he is giving a bad name, that is what the people call it. [sentence as heard] Incidentally, I am not the one who called it that; that is what people are calling it in their letters, too. So just look: There are people who are forbidden to speak. So there is already censorship throughout the whole country. Rutskoy's been forbidden to speak, to speak publicly on Moscow television. How can that be?

[Tolstykh] The newspaper PRAVDA, for instance—I do not know how you feel about that publication—published a list of 39 names recommended to speak, a photocopy of the list, and Rutskoy was not on that list. I had a look—Bonner, Mark Zakharov, [actor Zinoviy] Gerdt—but Rutskoy did not figure on that list. Nevertheless, I would like to leave that rather delicate subject and broach the most important topic concerning all of us: the economy. Naturally, at the heart of all problems is namely what is happening to the economy.

[Khasbulatov] I agree with you, but I would also like to make a few more comments about the referendum before going on to talk about the economic sphere. I cannot fail to draw attention to the fact that preparations are under way to distort the results of the referendum. [passage omitted]

There are reports coming in already—not just rumors—that in the Far East, for example, a lot of (?false papers) have been produced. There are signs of the same here as well. The impression one gets is that some sacks of ballots are being delivered around Russia's limitless spaces in the greatest secrecy, in the air, on the railways, and in road vehicles, and that some sort of cover-up operations [operatsii prikrytiya] are being drawn up. We have to draw attention to this aspect of the referendum.

[Tolstykh] Do you think that the [referendum] commission headed by Vasiliy Ivanovich Kazakov is capable of dealing with this?

[Khasbulatov] I think not. I think not. And another thing: You were asking in whose interests this economic and social policy is being pursued. Here is a letter in English in front of me, with a Russian translation.

The Moscow Regional Fund in Aid of the First President is urgently demanding an answer. I am inviting you with great pleasure to attend a special dinner in honor of and in aid of President Yeltsin to get to know him personally and for a tete-a-tete conversation with the government officials who are to direct Russia toward a market-based economy. This is a closed dinner sponsored by the Moscow Regional Fund in Aid of the First President.

The number of those invited is restricted to 100 exceptionally businesslike people. You will be served dinner and also personally introduced to Chernomyrdin, Shumeyko, Luzhkov, Muzykantskiy, (Resin), Burbulis, and (Kamchatov), presidential representatives. Now a very interesting detail. The dinner will take place this Friday, 23 April, at 1900 in the (Redisson Slavyanskaya). The cost of each ticket is $1,000. There are only 100 tickets available and there are restrictions: no more than five people from each corporation. All tickets are distributed on a first come-first served basis. All profit will be [words indistinct] Yeltsin.

Well, this is completely immoral. First, I would like to point out that the policy which is being implemented at present—judging by which people will either approve or disapprove the social policy—this policy is being determined by these 100 people, for whom it is nothing to fork out $1,000. As it turns out, all proceeds will go to help this first president of ours. This is direct interference, a direct bribe. Moreover [words indistinct] of foreign citizens in our affairs. So it is this policy that we are against and I, in particular, am against such interference, such a cynical action by our officials. This is what the vice president talked about in his speech. This is what we are against, you see, not against reforms, not against democracy, not against the political changes that are being implemented in our country, if they are directed toward the welfare and interests of the individual. This provides a direct transition to economic affairs and economic reform.

[Tolstykh] You know, that is a very good lead-in, because it is just what I wanted to ask you about. Take the second question, the second question of the referendum, no doubt the most crucial one, over which there have been all these disputes and debates. As for whether it is constitutional, whether it is legitimate at all, whether it is ethical, I do not care. We may or may not love the president, and we may respect or detest the deputies. These are our purely emotional assessments, those of all the mass of our people.

As for economic policy, however much someone may talk and shout and say how can metalworker Vasya grasp Geoffrey Sacks' strategic idea of reform....

[Khasbulatov, interrupting] Of course.

[Tolstykh] One feels sorry for metalworker Vasya and I want to say....

[Khasbulatov, interrupting] Yes, yes.

[Tolstykh] Wait a minute, wait a minute. But Vasya is the only one who has the right to decide whether Vasya wants that strategy!

[Khasbulatov] Of course, that is right.

[Tolstykh] But all joking aside, who? Our people, whom they are trying to convince that the freedom to be penniless is far better than cheap sausage? Perhaps I am arguing crudely, and someone may reproach me, but tell me: What can change if the economic policy of the president and government does not win approval in the referendum? Do they have anything to say to you, the Supreme Soviet, by way of objecting to the dogmatic assertion that there is no alternative to the course that is being pursued? If there is, what is the timetable for the possible realization of that program?

[Khasbulatov] As for an alternative, donit you think it is humiliating for our people, our specialists and academics, our factory managers, our managers in the various agricultural enterprises, our population of 150 million, which has been told for 75 years: As soon as yet another leader comes on the scene, it seems there is no alternative to him. We were told the same thing, you remember: There was no alternative to Lenin, no alternative to Stalin, no alternative to Khrushchev, no alternative to Brezhnev, no alternative to Andropov or to the unfortunate Chernenko.

Speaking about the apartment I live in, supposedly there is something wrong in that. I do live there, and they do say Chernenko lived in it.

[Tolstykh] Now they will say there is no alternative to Khasbulatov [words indistinct].

[Khasbulatov] Incidentally, let me interrupt myself for a minute. They say [Moscow Mayor] Luzhkov yesterday threatened to take away my apartment. He was the one who gave it to me, by the way. I am not going to lose any sleep over it. When I was writing the thesis for my doctorate degree, I lived in a one-room apartment with two small children. As you can see, I survived, not to worry. If Luzhkov also wants this apartment, I will give it to him all right.

We keep saying: no alternative, again no alternative. With all due respect to Boris Nikolayevich, to say that there is no alternative to him is to humiliate your own people, other politicians, other capable people—a vast number of our citizens of Russia, of our Russian people. No alternative. What on earth is this? How come there is no alternative? Why can't the vice president be an alternative, why can't the prime minister be an alternative, or all the different ministers, public servants, heads of administration, chairs of Supreme Soviets of our republics, prime ministers in the republics, chairs of local soviets, heads of administration in oblasts and krays, and so on? Why, tell me.

I have been traveling around the country and I meet dozens and thousands of talented people, so how is it? But let me return to your question, where I see the alternative. I will speak about the course. I will not dwell on the program; it is rather boring and will not be clear. I would like only to cite one example: what alternative there has been, and what one we should carry out.

The key point of the economic reform is this wretched privatization—you remember, don't you? So the Supreme Soviet passed a bill on privatization. You know how it is being implemented. It is 10,000 rubles [R] for a voucher, also know as a Chub-buck [from the name of privatization leader Anatoliy Chubays]. What is R10,000 nowadays? Don't we all know? But everybody has conveniently forgotten this. So what the Supreme Soviet developed was a totally different thing. The government and the president chose to follow a totally different path. What I mean is they chose the path which is not provided for by the law.

What did the Supreme Soviet have in mind? What is in the Supreme Soviet's law on privatization? Well, it says that R10,000 will be deposited in your privatization account. This is not just a R10,000 check given to you, with which you can do whatever you want. You are allocated a personal privatization account, let's say at the beginning of 1992, just as it had been planned. By the way, we had planned it even earlier, in 1991. This scheme had been designed by Mikhail Dmitriyevich Maley in Silayev's government with help from a large number of experts. We had worked out and proposed a good law.

So, it was presumed that every citizen of the Russian Federation would be allocated at the beginning of 1992 a privatization account of R10,000. The account would grow at the same rate as natural inflation. Let's say that in 1992 you were allocated R10,000. Today this would be in the region of R400,000. So there would have been some sort of social protection for individuals. This is one of the principle approaches adopted by the Supreme Soviet in this matter. There you have it. This is the first point.

Second point. We have always said so, and I have always said so: Yes, we are in favor of privatization, but an intelligent privatization. What must be done? We have to strictly classify our entire economy. Which enterprises, which industries should remain in the state sector of the economy? Let's say transport, both rail and air transport, power engineering, the defense industry. These spheres of strategic importance must remain within a system of state regulation. By the way, as I have already said—and I do not like to repeat myself—in 1970 I obtained my candidate's degree. Do you know what the title was? The state sector in the Canadian economy and its management.

When I came to defend my doctorate, I studied the entire experience gathered in the world where these problems are concerned. In all the countries of the world—the United States, Japan, to say nothing of Western Europe—there exists a powerful state sector. It is planned, managed, organized by, and receives orders from the state. Its directors are appointed by the state, sometimes even by parliaments. That is why we should have had a clear demarcation of what is left to the state, what is being floated, what is being floated for individuals, what is being floated with foreign participation, and so on and so forth.

Incidentally, and so my words will not have a hollow ring to them, I would like to say that the Supreme Soviet had such a program even before the Sixth Congress. At that time I spoke at a Supreme Soviet session and set out the basic guidelines, on the eve of the Sixth Congress. Moreover, then we had unity. Shumeyko, Filatov, to say nothing of Yuriy Mikhaylovich Voronin, they all took part in the elaboration of that program. But at that time we all spoke. Shumeyko, who does nothing but criticize, spoke in that vein then, in the same vein.

Now I want to say that a very serious economic program is practically having finishing touches put to it with the participation of the members of the government within the framework of the roundtable mentioned at the Seventh Congress. The general channel of economic consensus has taken a very precise shape.

When one begins to take a detailed and professional view, differences here are negligible. But all that politicking, all that desire not to let go, all this striving not to allow real control by representative authorities, this sense of not having enough power, all these semi-secret operations of the type mentioned by the vice president, that is what kills things.

[Tolstykh] Tell us, Ruslan Imranovich, if there are no particular fundamental or strategic differences between the government's policies and the Supreme Soviet's economic plan....

[Khasbulatov, interrupting] No, no, you have not understood me correctly. I have in mind the methodology: When we sit down and say this is the way, then we really do not have differences. But when the implementation begins, it is the same as when we adopted a law on privatization. It was completely misinterpreted, completely rejected, and the issuing of vouchers according to the Chubays plan began.

Here we have not just a divergence; this is where complete confrontation begins. It has to be confrontation. Why? Because they are simply acting in a completely barbaric way. They are destroying the economy, they are destroying the defense complex, they are destroying the whole social production infrastructure. You know, it is like a bull in a china shop. This is what it is all about.

What I want to say is this: When we sit down to discuss how things should be done, when we talk on a purely professional basis, it turns out that there is actually no divergence. So you ask them: Why then do you act like that? We are told: The president adopts decrees that are at variance with laws, and we have been instructed to do this and that.

Executive power now has three or four governments. Who is the head of government? I have no idea who is more important. I talked about it at the congress, whether Chernomyrdin is more important, or Chubays, or maybe Shumeyko. I really don't know. Maybe we have a new head of government emerging now, Filatov, maybe he is more important.

In the field of foreign policy it seems to me that Foreign Minister Kozyrev has completely overshadowed the prime minister. I have no idea who is more important. He seems to be even above the president. In the field of internal policy Poltoranin is even more important than the prime minister. So in the field of executive power we are totally disorganized; we have total anarchy. Those officials cannot carry out their business like that.

Therefore—I can see that we are quickly running out of time—this is what I believe: The referendum notwithstanding, life goes on. We will not allow any digressions from the Constitution. This is beyond question, and I would like everyone to know this. We have enough capabilities and power, I mean in terms of the Constitution.

I would like to take the opportunity to warn officials not to plead ignorance later on. I ask them all to guarantee the proper law and order and legality, legality, and that their behavior is completely subordinate to the demands of the Constitution and the law. All officials, regardless of the rank they hold.

So I want to say that we now have, in effect, the outline of what seems to me to be a very substantial solution to the situation that has taken shape. What is it, and is it realistic? We will not, of course, obtain an answer in the referendum. We have already spoken of a rough option. So the main option, and the most rational, is of course the formation of a government of national concord, answerable to parliament.

As for the president, I think that the president should not be the head of the executive. I think that the president should be awarded the title of head of state. That is not stipulated in the Constitution. He should be head of state, the actual, real head of state, but not head of the executive. The head of the executive must be the head of the government alone. That will be a very substantial step, a very substantial step, toward emerging from the constitutional impasse.

Further, naturally, we need to reach agreement with the president on holding joint elections. There should be elections for the president and the people's deputies. The date for holding them should be discussed and agreed, naturally. The next step—not the next one, rather, it already presupposes this—is that a very substantial elaboration of all laws connected with elections is necessary, of course.

We are not clinging on to the congress, either, but the congress is at present an element of the Constitution. In destroying the congress and trying to dissolve it, we are destroying the Constitution. This cannot be permitted. The congress itself must make the decision.

What decision? On electoral law, or a transitional statute in the present Constitution? We have already adopted such a statute. The future constitution does not assume a bicameral parliament; there is only a Supreme Soviet. We have no contradictions here at all, and the deputies understand that perfectly. They understand that perfectly.

Therefore there are ways out of here. We have a conception, not merely a theory but a hard-worked one which has been described many times and is supported by the vast majority of our society.

[Tolstykh] Ruslan Imranovich, unfortunately our time is almost up. One would not even have noticed how quickly it has passed. We have been talking here for almost 40 minutes and have not even noticed. I hope our viewers have not either. You have 30 seconds left.

[Khasbulatov] In these 30 seconds, I would like to say the following: I brought only one letter here and have almost forgotten all about it, to be honest. It is from (Sovchuk), of the Kuybyshev Rayon Soviet of People's Deputies of the city of Irkutsk. He asks me in his letter:

Esteemed Ruslan Imranovich, attacks are continuing. I would urge you to speak on television and tell our people that you are not claiming the post of president, that you have enough on your plate where you are. Honest to God, my esteemed colleague Sovchuk, I am saying what I have been saying time and time again. I have enough authority in my post of Supreme Soviet chairman, and I have said many times, if I remember correctly, that I am even prepared to resign, together with the president, should you trust it to be for the benefit for our Russia, the country that we should not only protect but save from a collapse right now. Again, why should I claim it? That is what I do not understand, why they keep accusing me of this.

[Tolstykh] Saying good-bye to our viewers, I would like to wish for tomorrow that when they come to cast their votes, they should have three feelings, internal drives as it were.

[Khasbulatov] Kindly, please. We cannot afford kindling hatred or provoking clashes with each other.

[Tolstykh] That is what I am suggesting. I do not know if you will support me. Three things: honor, reason, and motherland.

[Khasbulatov] Honor, reason, motherland, and conscience.

[Tolstykh] Then Russia will win. Are you with me?

[Khasbulatov] I support you completely and I urge everyone to vote as their conscience tells them.

[Tolstykh] On this note we will say good-bye to our viewers. Thank you. All the best.

Filatov, Chubays React

LD2404172693 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 1600 GMT 24 Apr 93

[Interview with Sergey Filatov, head of presidential administration, and vice premier Anatoliy Chubays, by correspondent S. Milyanchikov; date and place not given; From the "Novosti" newscast—live or recorded]

[Text] [Announcer A. Shashkov] I have been just told that our correspondent's report in connection with Khasbulatov's speech is ready. It is about the reaction of executive power to the speech of the head of the Russian legislature.

[Milyanchikov] Supreme Soviet Chairman Ruslan Khasbulatov made several statements in his television address this morning, which required additional comments.

[Filatov] The latest speech shown on television today contains many false facts.

[Milyanchikov] First, Khasbulatov accused the presidential team of using state funds to prepare the referendum, though it was the Supreme Soviet that was actually noticed doing this.

[Filatov] We had to take some steps and with regard to this the president issued a special instruction saying that the services should observe the law in line with the same decision of the Supreme Soviet.

[Milyanchikov] Second, the question of privatization.

[Chubays] It is very difficult somehow to discuss it seriously since the figure of 4 million or 4 billion could have been used equally well, and then there would have been a need to comment on where he took this figure from. It is crystal clear that Khasbulatov can promise anything you like, but we have only one answer: not words, not promises and not figures with many zeros which will be given to everybody in several years, but the real deed, the real deed which we have done. Honestly speaking, I think that Khasbulatov being so angry about it all is not a bad sign. It means that we are doing all right.

Communications Minister Dismisses Remarks

LD2404181393 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 1600 GMT 24 Apr 93

[Interview with Communications Minister Viktor Bulgak by unidentified correspondent in Moscow on 24 April; from the "Vesti" program—live or recorded]

[Text] [Announcer Aleksandr Shashkov] Reactions to Ruslan Khasbulatov's television appearance have started coming in almost immediately. Our correspondent has prepared a dispatch that deals with this reaction.

[Unidentified correspondent] Russia's Communications Minister Viktor Bulgak regards the statement made by parliament speaker Ruslan Khasbulatov about counterfeit ballots, as another stone thrown at the executive, this time in the shape of the Communications Ministry. Today he explained his position.

[Bulgak] We are only a transport office, or network. We work in accordance with the law. We have elaborated the whole procedure and technique of working with ballots. We receive them from agents at oblast commissions, deliver them to agents at rayon commissions in special sealed and stamped sacks with referendum labels attached. We hand them over in person. After that, we deliver them from rayon centers to every polling station in the same way. Hypothetically, of course, some digressions are possible, but not in the communication system. These digressions can only happen at polling stations themselves, if breaches of the vote-counting procedure are committed, or if there is a collusion between, say, the 15 members of the electoral commission.

Actually, each ballot paper also has a second protection system: It either has a stamp, or two signatures of specific members of the electoral commission on the reverse. So either the signatures or the stamp have to be forged, or else it all has to pass through expert assessment by members of the commission [sentence as heard].

There is only one aim here: to accuse someone, probably the executive power that works in conjunction with the electoral commission, of being able to use its position and be neglectful of these facts. Although, as you know, no facts have been cited.

[Shashkov] No facts have been cited, but we can still count on the referendum results not being rigged.

Zorkin Interviewed on Current Situation

LD2404114893 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1315 GMT 23 Apr 93

[Interview with Russian Constitutional Court Chairman Valeriy Zorkin by unidentified correspondent—live in studio]

[Excerpts] [Correspondent] I have the honor of presenting to you a very interesting speaker, our studio guest Russian Constitutional Court Chairman Valeriy Dmitriyevich Zorkin. Hello Valeriy Dmitriyevich.

[Zorkin] Hello dear listeners.

[Correspondent] Well, I think all our listeners could testify that when Valeriy Dmitriyevich appears on the air, whether on television or radio, the conversation always as a rule concerns serious political issues, and today we will of course also examine these. I think you have probably already guessed what that is going to be about. By the way, you can ask questions yourselves. Here are our telephone numbers: 215-2229 and 215-0574. [passage omitted]

Well, now let us really talk about serious things. As I have already said, in the last few days the Constitutional Court has ruled about the compliance with the basic law of the system of vote counting in the first two questions presented in the referendum. From now on, as we all know, a decision will be regarded as adopted if more than 50 percent of the people who attend the referendum vote in favor of it. But what about questions three and four? You said that they comply with the basic law. I feel there is a certain confusion in some minds here.

[Zorkin] Well, I do not know, perhaps there will be confusion, depending on whose minds these are, some minds will be confused about some matters, other minds about other matters. Anyway, we did not strive to please any one side, one set of minds. We wanted to act according to the Constitution. That is how things are here.

Questions three and four concern early elections of the president and early elections of deputies. Do we have this in our Constitution or do we not? Are there provisions for this? That is why the answer to this question about the referendum relates to constitutional issues. And the law on referendum says that in such an event, it is required that more than half of the entire body of voters entitled to vote in our country has to vote; that is, not just those who choose to vote.

[Correspondent] That is, all those who have reached a certain age and are entitled to vote.

[Zorkin] That is right. And all those means not only those who are here right now, but all citizens of Russia who have perhaps gone abroad somewhere.

[Correspondent] Or live in the former Soviet republics.

[Zorkin] That is right, absolutely right. That is why any attempts to restrict their right to vote is a violation of the principles of democracy, the fundamental principles of the constitutional system. We have to remember that.

[Correspondent] You know, another question arises here. Forgive me, but I am going to ask you about it. There is a rumor, a view—I cannot say that I myself hold it—that the Constitutional Court does not always rule clearly on this or that question. There is the following example here: the hearing into the so-called notorious case of the CPSU, when you said that the CPSU in a sense no longer existed so the question no longer arose—it went away by itself. And I think you discussed that for a very long time. What was it? Four months?

[Zorkin] Longer than that. If you consider the preparation for the case, to all intents and purposes it took nearly a year.

[Correspondent] And then this ruling. Do you think you did everything right at the time?

[Zorkin] The point is that we made a ruling and now judges have not re-examined it, they are not entitled to re-examine it as long as there are no grounds. I think we made the right ruling in the sense that we made it within the Constitution and in defense of the Constitution. It is a different question that for some people there might be some things unclear there and we can interpret them. But the point is that the main thing now is to comply with this ruling. When they say which way the court is looking, it seems the ruling is being violated; it is up to the executive authorities now.

[Correspondent] Right, concerning the CPSU—by the way, I am sorry I can no longer remember whose question this was, well, we do not have all that much time, we have about 40 minutes—someone has asked—I can no longer remember who, I am sorry, if I find it, I will read out our listener's name, the surname and the patronymic—the question is as follows: you said that the CPSU did not exist, so the issue itself no longer arose, while in the meantime the Communist Party of Russia is recreating its organizational structures and beginning to influence public life in an active way. What do you think about this?

[Zorkin] Well, this presumably refers to the fact that the CPSU had fallen apart, which is how indeed it was. Now the question of what is now being created, recreated, and what it is...

[Correspondent, interrupting] Excuse me, this question was asked by Muscovite Aleksey Nikolayevich Mironykh.

[Zorkin] Right. The question amounts to what is now being created, recreated, and so on. Do I understand this right?

[Correspondent] Yes, that is right. Of course, that is what it is about.

[Zorkin] Well, the first argument is that in the constitutional system, in a democratic society, any party has the right to exist on one condition: that they stay within the Constitution. Consequently, the Communist Party, the Communists, are also entitled to operate. That is their legal, constitutional right. That is how things are in all states of the civilized world that are called law-governed states, where the constitution prevails. The second question is: Does such a party work within the Constitution? So no one has any doubts that the Communists are entitled to create a party and even have regional organizations. If esteemed People's Deputy Travkin's party exists with its local, regional organizations, why cannot a Communist Party exist?

[Correspondent] Yes, of course.

[Zorkin] But what is very important in the court's ruling is that we disqualified, that is ruled as not complying with the Constitution, the structure of the former CPSU and the RSFSR Communist Party, to the extent that it substituted itself for state bodies, blended with them, and dictated things to them as a monopolist party, that is...

[Correspondent, interrupting] At the time.

[Zorkin] Of course.

[Correspondent] This should be emphasized: at the time.

[Zorkin] Of course. Structures of that kind cannot be reborn in the form of striving for a monopoly again. Structures that bring Communists together have the right to exist, but, I repeat, on one condition: that they are not going to recreate the previous structures.

[Correspondent] Aha, right. I completely agree with you, and I think we have clarified this question.

Now let us come back to the referendum, which is completely natural. It is going to take place the day after tomorrow [25 April]. The following question arises here: in connection with the ruling made by the Constitutional Court on the first two questions, how do you see the consequences of the referendum, what will—let us say—life be like globally after 25 April, once the results are counted?

[Zorkin] Well, as far as globally is concerned, as you know I am not [word indistinct].

[Correspondent] Yes, that is good. [laughter]

[Zorkin] But it is possible to conjecture what options there will be. In this respect I am worried by some things. I am worried by some statements I have heard on the eve of the referendum. They say: if so many vote for me, I will dissolve Congress or something else. You see? This gives rise to some, I would say, very...

[Correspondent, interrupting] You are referring to the president?

[Zorkin] I am referring not so much to the president as the president's entourage, let us put it that way. But all in all to the executive authority in its entirety.

[Correspondent] Right, right.

[Zorkin] This is very worrying because there is the Constitution that provides for the procedure for all these actions. If a new norm is being introduced, like that which follows from the referendum, it will become a part of the Constitution. But the results of the referendum do not give anyone, and I stress this, do not give the executive power, legislative, or judicial power any advantages which already exist in the Constitution. To act unilaterally is anticonstitutional and I warn that the Constitutional Court will stand up in defense of the Constitution.

[Correspondent] So we have to emphasize here, and I think that above all you are going to do this since you are the chairman of the Constitutional Court, that the referendum, its results, should simply provide some kind of orientation...

[Zorkin, interrupting] Of course.

[Correspondent, continuing] ... for the activities of the executive and legislative authorities.

[Zorkin] Depending on the answers, about which...

[Correspondent, interrupting] That is right, depending on the answers.

[Zorkin, continuing] ...we can conjecture, let us say, whether it will be yes or no. Well, depending on that there will be consequences. But all the consequences must be resolved within the framework of the Constitution. None of the sides has the right to act unilaterally. Otherwise it will go outside the framework of the Constitution and will become an anticonstitutional side.

[Correspondent] Here is a phrase for you from Antonina Vasilyevna—she did not give her surname—a Muscovite: Thank you to Zorkin for his courage. There you are, thanks to you for your courage.

Will a Constitutional Court be envisaged under the new Constitution? In connection with this there is a question from me: There is, I think it was presented today, a draft or, let us say, main provisions of a new constitution. You have seen them, you are familiar with them. You have already spoken about it in ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in your last interview for that publication, and in that interview you said in particular that according to the old Constitution, or strictly speaking according to the present Constitution, to which you in fact swore, it is possible to live and work, although there are certain remnants of past years.

[Zorkin] Yes, I did say that then.

[Correspondent] You did?

[Zorkin] That is right.

[Correspondent] So in your opinion, Valeriy Dmitriyevich, do we need to adopt a new constitution or is it infinitely better to keep on correcting the present one?

[Zorkin] [passage omitted] I would like to assure everyone that as long as I live I will stand on the basis of the Constitution, and Russians will not regret it.

As far as the Constitution is concerned, yes, we did swear to this Constitution, and that is why we cannot leap beyond its bounds. What I ask is what kind of constitution is it when someone says: I did not swear to this Constitution. Let us see what is in this constitution: The principle of separation of powers is there; presidential powers, very extensive, are there; legislative authority is there; judicial authority is there; a declaration of human rights and the federal treaty—federal relations are there. So what stops us from living according to the Constitution? The layers of contradictions between the powers of the Congress and the executive authorities? Well, this can be removed. For this, of course, we need agreement, and here it is partly the fault of the Congress; it is partly the fault of the executive authorities, they cannot come to an agreement between themselves. But that is not an issue of the Constitution but an issue of the parties involved, because if they do not know how to agree and live according to the Constitution, tomorrow there will appear an ideal constitution, the conflict remains, and they are going to seek pretexts in the articles of the ideal constitution. What it is I do not know, I have not read it yet. I have indeed seen some preparatory materials and drafts.

As far as the Constitutional Court is concerned, I frankly think there is an attempt there, in my view it is a political attempt, to lasso the present Constitutional Court, because all three branches of the judicial authority—the Arbitration Court, the Supreme Court, and the Constitutional Court—are being joined together under the leadership of some sort of collegium of—let us say—syndics who get appointed and proposed by the president and...

[Correspondent, interrupting] What are they called? Syndics?

[Zorkin] Well, I do not know how it will be worded in the final text. They are court chairmen and some other people and so on. I ask: For what purpose is this being created? Why do these branches of the judiciary that we have developed have to be merged into one? I think someone simply finds the Constitutional Court inconvenient. That is, they act as follows: We do not like the actions, so we will crush the whole mechanism. That is more or less how people act when they do not like the president's actions—let us destroy the presidential republic in Russia. I think all in all that these are Bolshevik-style methods—neo-Bolshevik, all in all.

Would it not be better if having created mechanisms we put them into operation, approve, improve in some respects and so on?

[Correspondent] But if these mechanisms quickly rust, what do you do with them? What kind of lubricant, using an automotive allusion [words indistinct]?

[Zorkin] You have to look and see what is getting rusty: the driver or the car. You have to sort that out. But in our country they hack up the mechanism without having examined how the drivers drive it.

An ideal constitution—I ask: What is it? Is it something principally new as compared to the present Constitution? The powers are distributed more clearly. But there is also the same thing in the draft constitution that was prepared under the leadership of Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin as chairman of the constitutional commission, the one within the framework of preparing the Congresses and the Supreme Soviet.

[Correspondent] Right, right.

[Zorkin] If you do not like something, consult with the republics. I cannot understand why a new ideal draft is being sent out.

You see, there is also the following problem: society in conflict. One of the sides says: Here, I have the ideal philosopher's stone and I will save you with this ideal instrument. Might it not turn out that it will be quite the contrary, that this will add more conflict to the struggle for this constitution, so to speak? Perhaps it is worth it for the executive and legislative authorities to sit at the negotiating table. Or perhaps we should hold early elections and the new body will get down to this new constitution.

What is getting in the way of our life now if in the old Constitution there is every mechanism for realizing state authority and for its work?

[Correspondent] Well, there are excesses there—excuse me—references to the Soviet Union, there are...

[Zorkin, interrupting] There are, yes there are. But is that of principal importance?

[Correspondent] Well, no, I would not...

[Zorkin, interrupting] Does this form the principles of the constitution in general or is it something alien that should recede into the past?

To my mind, the most important thing is that the problem is being sought in the wrong place. The roots of the problem are being sought in the text of the Constitution, while to my mind the whole problem is in the execution. A mass of presidential decrees has already been concocted, whole heaps of them, but they are not being carried out—the decree on corruption, for instance...

[Correspondent, interrupting] Yes, you are right there.

[Zorkin, continuing] ...of 4 April 1992. And where is the execution of that decree? It is the same with laws. And the same thing will happen with the constitution. Let us learn to carry out fundamental principles.

Under these circumstances, saying things like: I did not swear to this Constitution, is a subversion of the constitutional system, because it means releasing other people from swearing to the Constitution. We may ask: What constitution did you not swear to? Indeed, there was no principle of separation of powers, no federative treaty, there was nothing on the declaration of human rights. Does that mean you did not swear to that, is that being rejected or what?

[Correspondent] Well, you know, everyone is upset now, I am and you are, whatever one might say...

[Zorkin, interrupting] No, no, calm down, I am not upset, I am thick-skinned, impenetrable, nothing gets to me. I am looking at this calmly, but of course I am looking at it with great sadness, because the argument of the unconstitutionality of the Constitution has always led to a subversion of the Constitution. That is very dangerous. It is one thing when a nation has no constitution at all and you say: Let us create a constitution. It is another thing when there is a constitution and it is being accused of being Brezhnev's constitution and all sorts of other things and so on. These are dangerous ideological manipulations, and I would even say that to some extent it is also deception of the people.

[Correspondent] Valeriy Dmitriyevich, are you a harsh man by nature?

[Zorkin] Well, I do not know, it is difficult to judge this for myself. Anyway, I do not ever like to shout; I do not like to make loud statements, but if I say something, I do it.

[Correspondent] I ask because in your court, in the body that you lead, there are various views there, as far as I know. There is a man called Ametistov who always comes out with separate opinions, and there are a few other judges.

[Zorkin] That is right. We joke that he is our man apart. But he is a sovereign judge, esteemed Ernst Mikhaylovich, and therein, in general, lies the virtue of the court—every judge can express a separate opinion if he disagrees with the majority ruling. It is a different question when the court ruling is being forgotten and the separate opinion is being extolled—that violates the principle of democracy. In a democracy the issue is decided by a majority.

In all civilized countries, law-governed states, a court ruling is sacred. Perhaps it is wrong about something a little, or even wrong about a lot, but if you undermine the significance of the court ruling, that means the arbiter disappears and everyone becomes the judge in his own case. In the American judicial system what happens is this: the Supreme Court delivers its verdict on a case with five votes for and four against—there are nine judges on the court there. No one says anything or shouts about particular opinions on TV programs, but people say: the court has delivered its verdict. Particular opinions are published in the appropriate papers there, etc. But the fact that a point can come when people turn to a court whose authority has already been greatly eroded, then it is difficult, in general, to pass judgement.

[Correspondent] So how do you manage the judges if they have their particular opinions, since there ought to be a monolith, you understand?

[Zorkin] This is a specific feature of the court. After all, we are not a ministry where the minister is the sole person in charge, and we are not a presidency where the president would say something and where everything is subordinate, so to speak, in a vertical fashion. A court is a special body. All judges are equal, the chairman has powers—and seemingly large powers according to the law on the Constitutional Court—but they do not amount to being able to dictate the judges' will. I do not do this and do not have any right to do this. A court's verdict is drawn up during the course of a session.

[Correspondent] Are there times when you use a tough approach, especially when sessions are being held behind closed doors?

[Zorkin] What do you mean by a tough approach? I do not dictate, I am not a dictator, you understand. I am the session's leader, that is all.

[Correspondent] Excuse me, you may not be able to answer this question, but there is a very curious question here—one Yan Grinsteyn from Tula asks who introduced judge's robes to the Constitutional Court. Don't you think that our people do not understand this innovation?

[Zorkin] First, I will answer this question. But since I have got used to the fact that my life involves searching for answers to my own questions, I answer questions directed to me. I will answer this question: the court did not have anything to do with this; it is the work of the Supreme Soviet; they made provisions for it.

[Correspondent] Why do they like robes?

[Zorkin] I do not think it is a case of them liking or not liking robes, but probably because, well, the military wear uniforms and this somehow distinguishes a soldier. A judge, when he is putting on his robe, is doing this not because he wants to be above others; it is because it is a special attribute—I think—which creates the psychological atmosphere in the court. The judge does not blend in with the masses, he becomes an arbiter, he is not on the side of one person or another. This gives rise to a feeling of responsibility in those who come to court and those in the court itself. I think we see the meaning a uniform has in human society for the military, for religious servants, for school pupils, and so on.

[Correspondent] When you are not working you dress, nevertheless, in a totally civilian fashion.

[Zorkin] Of course I do not go about in my judge's robes. I think that if I went around in my robes when off duty I probably should not be allowed into the court, but put somewhere else.

[Correspondent] A question from Yekaterina Ivanovna—for some reason, we again have a listener who does not give her surname, but she is from Moscow: Why has the National Salvation Front been left alone? Her question has been put bluntly. You might shroud it in the appropriate wording typical of you, but still the question has been asked.

[Zorkin] Let me tell you, we have not dealt with the issue of whether or not the National Salvation Front and its activities and so on are constitutional. What we have had is a petition relating to the president's decree banning the preparatory, founding, preliminary organization set up to create the National Salvation Front. Our Constitution says that no civil right—the right to form public organizations—may be restricted other than by a court decision. If the president thought that organization was unconstitutional, he should have applied to the court, and then we would have dealt with the matter. I stress, if an organization exceeds the terms of its registered rules and infringes the Constitution, then of course that is grounds for us to consider whether it is constitutional.

[Correspondent] But you know, they look as though they are infringing the Constitution.

[Zorkin] I cannot say that, because we have not considered the issue.

[Correspondent] Might you regard the question as provocative?

[Zorkin] No, why should I? I do not divide questions into provocative and unprovocative. I can classify them by other criteria.

[Correspondent] [passage omitted] Aleksey Khripunov from Novocherkassk asks what you, the chairman of the Russian Constitutional Court, think of the case of the State Committee for the State of Emergency and what consequences might await the people of Russia in this connection.

[Zorkin] I cannot say anything about this, because there are certain aspects of that case that might come before the Constitutional Court, if it has to be checked whether the manner in which the law was applied with regard to this case complied with the Constitution. These are matters under the jurisdiction of the Constitutional Court. For this reason, it would be impermissible from the legal point of view for me to speak about this subject now, and I think it would also be unethical.

[Correspondent] That is a good answer. Now we have a couple of questions on the personality and activities of Vice President Aleksandr Rutskoy. Is it right for Aleksandr Vladimirovich to speak in the mass media—it says here in explaining documents, but what I think they meant was the media—on the issue of corruption.

[Zorkin] Well, you see, if the vice president, in his capacity as head of the anticorruption commission, deems it possible to address the public, I think he is probably within his rights, and he must have weighed his actions carefully. Moreover, let us ask ourselves a question; on 4 April 1992, the president of the Russian Federation issued a decree on fighting corruption—but where are the results? Everybody says corruption is there. If it is not there, then say so in so many words. But everybody—I mean businessmen, entrepreneurs, and workers—says it is, and quote a saying to the effect that you will not get anywhere without a bribe, as it were. Foreign investors too do not want to deal with Russia until we curb corruption. After all, what is enterprise? Honest law-abiding enterprise in accordance with the Constitution is based on legal equality and on parity between its participants, on coordination of will. What you give is what you get—not playing by the rules of corruption, but legally. Otherwise we have a state nourisher [kormlenshchik], which throws us back to the 15th century, robbing the people—both workers and even entrepreneurs. I think even entrepreneurs are complaining about this. So I believe that curbing corruption is not just our sacred duty, as it were, but also an absolute necessity, because we are turning into a criminal, corruption-ridden state. I believe that with Rutskoy it was probably a cry from the heart. I believe we are on the brink of catastrophe.

[Correspondent] Valeriy Dmitrievich, the question I asked has another implication: Would it not have been wiser to start a series of criminal proceedings first?

[Zorkin] Well, maybe they have been started—the way they should be started. Do you really think no signals have been sent to the very top? Remember, Aleksandr Vladimirovich said that even his powers had been insufficient. He had submitted files, and so had [Yuriy] Boldyrev [head of the Control Directorate of the president's staff and chief state inspector of the Russian Federation]. A question that has to be asked is where was all this buried? Who was involved in burying it? Let us sort it out at last! The people of Russia are waiting for an answer!

[Correspondent] No doubt. So you believe it was quite normal for him to speak.

[Zorkin] The other matter, I believe, is that the procurator's office should get involved in this. But this is for the crime prevention commission, in which investigators and the procurator's office are involved. I believe they can attend to all of this. Let me remind you, by the way, that many people make a connection between the president's address of 20 March and attacks at the Constitutional Court started by the press. I would like to draw our listeners' attention to the fact that, in our estimate, these attacks started earlier. They started after we had stated at the Eighth Congress that the Constitutional Court would not just keep observing things, but would raise the issue of relevant public servants, of their constitutional responsibility; that is, on how they implement crime prevention.

[Corresondent] You have described yourself as a thick-skinned man, but you are reacting rather sensitively to these attacks, I would say. Maybe it is not worth it.

[Zorkin] I react sensitively because I am a feeling being.

[Correspondent] This offends you.

[Zorkin] No, I am above such feelings. You see, when I am insulted I hide it deep down. When a newspaper insults me and I....[pauses] I may make a small mistake—when I answer this or that newspaper—like in a name of a street, or an address, but not in the essence of things. [sentence as heard] Instead of checking the essence of things, they publish disgusting lies that travel fast. But this question is the question of growth toward freedom. The matter is that this forces you to grow a thick skin, professionally, in this sense. But it would be deeply erroneous to say I sit there and see nothing. I see it all.

[Correspondent] I see that you do suffer; you feel it deeply.

[Zorkin] Of course I do. Anatoliy, you would not refuse me the feeling that I am a citizen of Russia, and should I want our country to be humiliated and abused, brought to its knees, that people live in squalor, and that we move closer to catastrophe? I want to put my efforts into getting us out of this state.

[Correspondent] Of course. Here is a somewhat natural question: Grigoriy Ivanovich—again no surname. Is it some kind of epidemic among our readers not to give their surnames? It may be some kind of relapse to old times.

[Zorkin] It may be just forgetfulness, or a desire to be brief.

[Correspondent] Why does the Constitutional Court ignore the events of Belovezhskaya Pushcha that took place back in 1991?

[Zorkin] I would like to tell respected citizens of Russia that we cannot start everything of our own accord. The law is such that in many issues we need a petition. I would like to say that as far as Belovezhskaya Pushcha is concerned, we have received a petition urging us to consider the constitutionality of this whole CIS agreement, and since I believe we will have a calm period coming up, and such events as 20 March or the referendum will not reoccur, this case will then be the order of the day.

[Correspondent] You have put it in such a way; could the Constitutional Court be able to restore the Soviet Union? Is such a thing possible? You do not have to answer if you do not want to.

[Zorkin] First, I cannot give you an extensive answer, for which I hope our listeners will forgive me. It is not because I am trying to be evasive. There is a petition, and as a judge, I have no right to comment on the essence of this, but speaking in general terms, I can say that the court is not insane and does see the processes of the disintegration that is taking place. Neither is it insane in terms of trying to restore something that cannot exist. I do not know; it is up to politicians to solve such a question. Our question is: Was it in accordance with the Constitution or not? [passage omitted]

I would like to draw your attention to the fact that the Americans drew up their Constitution when all conflicts were more or less over, and a quiet period of stabilization started. Constitutions should never be drawn up in periods of strife, because in this case it just will not be observed. [passage omitted] There [in the United States] you would never have a president come out and say that he has signed a decree to the effect that starting from next day no one can revoke his decrees. This has never happened in the United States. There the President works with the Congress. It may be difficult, and he has to compromise, to make concessions, but this is a great advantage. President Roosevelt, the great Roosevelt of the 1930's, managed to bring the country out of the Great Depression of the late twenties and early thirties—which was possibly worse than what we have now—just through consolidating legality in the state. Hitler, however, wished to express the will of the people outside the framework of parliament, contrary to parliament—directly, as it were. We all know what the result was.

[Correspondent] You drew the same parallel in an interview with ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA. Do you think it holds water? All this stuff about Roosevelt in our situation and all that.

[Zorkin] Well, I do not want to accuse any particular official in this country. I am not talking about this, but about general trends. Unless we live by the Constitution, we will end up with Fascism or something else, as it were, because an attempt to settle conflicts in our afflicted country today by dictatorial means is a vain attempt. Dictatorship would not last, and the country would collapse because of the general condition, because of separatist tendencies, the state of the Army, and so on. Then all conflicting parties will start fighting each other, the genie will be released from its bottle, and it will mean collapse and catastrophe for Russia. The opportunity of rule-of-law development will be lost.

[Correspondent] Do you think there will be dictatorship? Is such a thing possible?

[Zorkin] No, I do not. On the contrary, I hope for, and I will work for, the triumph of rule-of-law in Russia. There are two words in Russian with one root: truth and justice. These have been here longer than the word dictatorship entered the Russian language. We, citizens of Russia, should not forget these sacred Russian words.

[Correspondent] Let me return again to your ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA interview, your most recent interview. You mentioned there that you believed there would be a time in Russia when a civilized president and a civilized parliament would be nurtured. How and with what means will this happen?

[Zorkin] I do not mean any offense to the incumbent parliament and the current president, I respect them both and I also respect the court, by the way. But I believe we are all imperfect. We are all children of the past, with its strong tendencies of neo-Bolshevism and of radicalism. These are deeply rooted in all of us. We must learn to live in a universal space.

[Correspondent] You mean you also have all of that.

[Zorkin] Yes I do. We must learn to smile, to see other people, our fellow Russians, as friends, not as sworn enemies. If we proceed from this assumption, then the era of this mutual annihilation will end. But I believe a new generation ought to be brought up to achieve this. I believe the virus injected by revolutionary democratic extremism needs to be annihilated—the likes of first killing the tsar, then carrying out the great experiment, then promising a happier future, now yet another happier future, as in that August when tanks were brought in to achieve a happy life through revolution. Nothing good has ever come out of it; what has come out of it is Nagorno-Karabakh, the long-suffering North Caucasus. [Ingush] President [Ruslan] Aushev recently sent a cable full of grief to the Constitutional Court. There is a tragedy there, and I fear all of Russia may catch its fire. That is why the cry from my heart, and maybe from the heart of every citizen of Russia, is: stop it. But how can we achieve this? I believe only by renouncing extremism and understanding. We are standing at the final frontier, and we must think better of it.

[Correspondent] You scare me. I do hope that tanks...

[Zorkin, interrupting] I am not scaring you. Tanks will not be out in the streets. This is not in our nature anymore, we now want to live in freedom. No more stadiums, no more Red Army trains, no more Siberian labor camps. I believe we will enter a civilized space in a dignified way. We must stop testing one another with strong-arm tactics that threaten to breach the Constitution. We must stop threatening: I will abolish the Constitution if I need to, and then I will make you happy with a new ideal one. This is dangerous.

[Correspondent] We will return yet again to your trip to the United States in March. You talked with President Bill Clinton and Vice President Gore. What did they ask you?

[Zorkin] I not only talked with them, I talked first and foremost with the chief justice of the Supreme Court. I made a speech at the annual meeting of the U.S. bar. I talked with the leaders and senators of Congress, with the judical elite. That was the talks. Naturally, everywhere questions were asked about the possibility, the likelihood, of Russia's development in a civilized manner. And I replied yes on the condition that authorities, the president included, understand that one cannot act using Bolshevik extremist methods, drawing on the radical part of those around one so to speak. The president must pursue a main direction in a policy that expresses the interests of all the people. Otherwise neither presidential power nor any other type of power will retain its position. Reform should be accepted by the people, and not thrust upon them from above by force, any force—with weapons or anything else. If this does not happen there will be a tearing apart. Perception is tested by experience, but experience tells us that we have all become immersed in poverty. Our position is getting worse, no matter what they assure us. The decline in production, hyperinflation, the squandering of strategic resources, the terrible corruption—what does that point to? It points to the fact that one must urgently change one's course. If the authorities in power do not change the existing course, they will not be the only ones to blow up, the whole of Russia will explode.

[Correspondent] Does this also apply to those in power?

[Zorkin] Naturally. But we, by our methods—if you have in mind judicial power, part of the authorities, albeit somewhere up above; I think incidentally that this places responsibility on us as well—proceeding from this we are trying to ensure, by our own methods, that the constitutional and economic rights of citizens are protected. This has happened because of the misinterpretation of what was perhaps a good idea—voucherization, so to speak, translated into privatization and so forth. It has turned out that in practice it has acquired such an ugly character that the gap between a small group of rich people and the remaining people who have been plundered has become more yawning. Do not get me wrong; I am in favor of us getting onto a new economic track, of moving into our future, civilized economy, but if we do not take this breakdown, this indigence, into account, then we will create a basis for dictatorship by mob rule, which will manipulate the long-suffering people. It is a must that the people should immediately drag themselves out of this poverty. Otherwise neither democracy nor a law-based state will hold its position. Surely that is understandable. It is as easy as ABC, which, generally speaking, everyone has known for a long time.

[Correspondent] Have you destroyed your own voucher?

[Zorkin] No, my own voucher is lying around in my desk somewhere because I think that what is happening with voucherization in practice is in actual fact what is happening to us, the poor Russians.

[Correspondent] But for all that you are keeping it. Do you think that is an erroneous course?

[Zorkin] Well, you have simply reminded me of it. I admit to you that I had forgotten about my own personal voucher, but I remembered what form the practice of voucherization has taken.

[Correspondent] Well, do not let us end our conversation on an argument.

[Zorkin] No, no.

[Correspondent] You know there is a question here, but unfortunately I have lost it again. I do apologize. Valeriy Dmitriyevich, a certain lady from St. Petersburg, I think, is asking this question. It is now spring, don't you feel like dropping everything and going away somewhere?.

[Zorkin] No. I wanted to do that in winter and not just in spring. It happens especially when the weather is fine and good thoughts come into one's head. I think we should always remember that. We are caught in a vicious circle, you understand, we have become politicized. We are starting to have a sullen expression on our faces. But we are, you see, people. We should think about good things, perhaps about eternal things, about divine things. And what is divine is first and foremost man himself.

[Correspondent] Excuse me, on Easter night I saw you at the Cathedral of the Epiphany. Are you a believer?

[Zorkin] Yes, I am a believer. But I would not like that to be advertised, because that is the personal affair of each person, although perhaps television filmed it. You know, man is created in the image of God; it is something sacred so to speak. You understand that we are trampling on the essence of people when we turn each other into enemies. We are deviating from everything that man has been endowed with. Man has been endowed with reason and feeling. Instead of realizing these qualities in general, we are starting to reproduce a situation of chaos and civil war. One has to understand that there are many different colors in the world. There is no need to turn us into white and red, black and white. [passage omitted]

[Correspondent] I believe this is a worthy finale of our discussion with Valeriy Dmitriyevich Zorkin, chairman of the Russian Constitutional Court. What can I tell you, Valeriy Dmitriyevich, hold up and keep in good form.

[Zorkin] In fact, it is you who should hold up, for as long as we have real free mass media, the country will have a genuine fourth estate. Then the other three can live in peace. But we will protect you.

[Correspondent] Thank you and good bye.

Government Criticizes Rutskoy's Role as IDC Chairman

LD2404111893 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1052 GMT 24 Apr 93

[Text] Moscow April 24 TASS—"Instead of using materials for their proper purpose, the chairman of the Interdepartmental Commission (IDC) for Combatting Crime and Corruption sacrificed his possession of knowledge to a political struggle," points out a statement made public here on Saturday [24 April] by the press service of the Russian Government in view of recent public speeches by Vice-President Aleksandr Rutskoy about the state of affairs concerning action to combat crime.

The government of the Russian Federation, the statement said, is deeply concerned over the deterioration of the criminogenic situation in the country and first of all over instances of corruption in state power and administration bodies as doing the greatest harm to the prestige of power bodies and current reforms. With a view to combatting the evil, the IDC, with the vice-president at the head, was set up on the initiative of the president of the Russian Federation.

However, instead of coordinating the work to fight crime and corruption, the IDC chief, having access to materials, including confidential ones, and possessing enough authority and powers, limited himself to the role of a person registering developments and accumulating facts, the statement said.

The stand of the prosecutor-general of the Russian Federation—who, as an IDC member, could not fail to know about the documents gathered by the IDC—gives rise to bewilderment. He did not react in any way to the facts recorded in the collected documents until the vice-president's speech in the Supreme Soviet (parliament), the statement noted.

The work to check the stated facts and reveal breaches of the current legislation in the activities of power and administration bodies and officials is being continued, the statement said.

"Those guilty of committing offences, whose guilt will be proved in accordance with a procedure established by law, will be called to account in accordance with law provisions irrespective of their positions," the statement pointed out.

Rutskoy Statement on Ostankino's Refusal of Airtime

PM2304163993 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 24 Apr 93 First Edition p 2

[Unattributed report under the rubric "Ban on the Truth": "'Ostankino' Turns Vice President Down"]

[Text] Russian Federation Vice President Aleksandr Rutskoy has made a statement. It says: "Realistically assessing the situation prevailing today in the Russian Federation and the increasing threat of the criminalization of state power, on 16 April 1993 I delivered a briefing in the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet on the activity of the Interdepartmental Commission To Combat Crime and Corruption. Specific instances were cited of serious abuses of official position by government officials and cases of corruption among the top echelons of power which received the green light as a result of a number of decisions by the government and the president of the Russian Federation. Documents demonstrating just who has created and is creating the conditions for the plundering of the country beneath the slogan of reform were made public.

"Instead of an objective assessment of the problems of corruption and economic crimes committed in the country, the 'Ostankino' television and radio company, Russian Television, and newspapers such as ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI, IZVESTIYA, MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI, and MOSKOVSKIY KOMSOMOLETS have mounted a powerful 'vindication' campaign to make the population vote in favor of the policy of plundering the country. Prime airtime and the front pages are being placed at the disposal of precisely the people who are directly implicated in the cases cited in my speech.

"With the clear encouragement of the Russian Federation president's team, these attempts at self-justification are descending to overt lies and insults aimed at me. Revealingly, none of the people I named is turning to the courts.

"Realizing the seriousness of the situation, especially on the eve of the referendum, when massive attempts to deceive the people in order to remain in power and evade responsibility are being made once again, I asked V.I. Bragin, chairman of the 'Ostankino' Russian State Television and Radio Company, to give me one hour of live airtime Friday 23 April. I was intending to acquaint Russian citizens with specific documents confirming the facts about extremely flagrant violations of the law and damage to the state's interests on the part of many of the country's top officials. Unfortunately, this request from the vice president was turned down. Instead of this it was suggested he take part in 'Talk Show,' produced by the 'VID' TV company, which I respect. I refused to take part in the 'show.'

"I think that Russians, and not only those living in Russia, would like to have the opportunity to see the relevant documents so they can make an objective assessment of the situation prevailing in Russia.

"This position on the part of the 'Ostankino' leadership is surprising, to put it mildly, since a number of state officials directly implicated in the squandering of state money and in inflicting large-scale losses on the country's economy are allocated airtime virtually immediately."

From the Editorial Office: We are sure the president does not know about this case. We can imagine how angry Boris Nikolayevich would be with Poltoranin and Bragin when he remembered the humiliations visited upon him by the previous "Ostankino" leadership during his time as chairman of the Russian Supreme Soviet and also as president of Russia (before August 1991).

Or has all this been forgotten? Can young Russian democracy be crucified like a streetwalker?

Is there anything surprising about this? There is no shame. Just cynicism...

'Excerpt' of Interview With Rutskoy on Politics

LD2304183693 Moscow Ostankino Television First Channel Network in Russian 1515 GMT 23 Apr 93

["Excerpt" from interview with Vice President Aleksandr Rutskoy, including commentary and introduction by Aleksandr Tikhomirov, journalist and people's deputy; from the "Carriage 03" program [Vagon 03]; produced by Novaya Studiya; Rutskoy remarks recorded "two weeks ago"; place not given]

[Text] [Tikhomirov] I will state right away that Novaya Studiya does not approve of my position as journalist and deputy, but has not prevented this program from going on air. Well, thanks for that, because I now have the possibility to provide, so to speak, patronage in our railway carriage for the vice president to go on air—the vice president, who is being blamed for everything now. This is an excerpt from an interview which he gave us two weeks ago:

[Rutskoy] You know, 18 months of torture—there is no other word for it. If I was born again, I would never deliberately put myself into such a situation again. I am saying this in all seriousness. You know, many have agreed, politics is a dirty business. I have never agreed with this, and I have always tried to convince everybody and show that it all depends on the politicians who are involved in politics. Today, it really is dirty and criminal. So we have the consequences of this. They are trying to make an economic and political garbage dump of Russia. I have been suffering this for 18 months—for one reason.

If I had been appointed, I would have left long ago. I have civilian specialities—I am a restoration artist; I have the civilian speciality of being an engineer for the operation of planes and motors; I have a military speciality which can be used in civilian life. I am a pilot, a highly qualified pilot.

I would have left long ago, but I was elected. I was elected together with the president. I visited 14 oblasts in the Russian Federation. I remember well what I promised people, what I told them in support of the president's program. I promised: I will try to the best of my possibilities and ability to do this. Maybe it will not always work out—that is natural because no one is immune from mistakes. But in many things, you see how they try to help me to implement the programs that the president put forward and the vice president put forward together with him at the elections.

I cannot betray the people who elected me, who trusted in me. Therefore, I will be here to the end. And one further reason—when I imagine that Starovoytova could be here, that Shakhray could be here, that Burbulis or Volkogonov could be here, you know I get goose pimples. God forbid, as they say. I have sufficient strength. You cannot frighten me—I have seen things—God forbid that anyone should see what I have seen.

I have almost been killed twice, so I think that you cannot frighten me with anything. Once people have put their trust in me, I will be here to the end. If they will not trust me, or do not believe me, and people demand it, I will go.

Moreover, now there is the referendum. Let them write, let them write that they do not believe in me, but everyone should go to the referendum—it is not a political action, it is not a political action, it is the last possibility, the last possibility for Russia. Russia is facing a choice—either it will be revived and will be a highly moral, highly developed economic state, which the whole world will reckon with, or it will be an economic and political garbage dump. One of the two.

I am not telling anyone how to vote, but everyone should go, and not give in to calls by the first deputy chairman of the government, Shumeyko, who says, talking to the citizens of Russia, that it is necessary to carry out the president's request and answer yes to all questions.

What is interesting here—on the third question, on early presidential elections, our supporters and opponents among the electorate will urge us toward this, so this is what to do: come, write yes, take the voting paper and wreck the referendum [as heard]. Well done! Thirty billion going to waste—this cannot be allowed.

Honor, conscience, and dignity—and if there still remains in people a feeling of love toward their homeland, Russia, which has a history of a thousand years, which has lived through three periods of darkness, a fourth period of darkness cannot be allowed, but it is already knocking at the door. Therefore, if there are some people—polls are being published, 41 percent are saying that they will not go to the referendum, but we will go to early elections, I want to tell the people who think like that, afterward there will be no people to elect and there will be nothing to choose.

[Tikhomirov] It has already been announced that Rutskoy will be dealt with after the refefendum. He should have sat down and stayed quiet as had been expected—but he went and got involved in economic policies. A general without an army. A hero of the Soviet Union who never—that is what Chubays said yesterday—carried out a single heroic deed in his life. A traitor, as they write, the exact opposite of a good fellow, he sits alone under a portrait of Peter [the Great] in the office where Stolypin [Russian reformist prime minister at the beginning of the century] once sat.

Rutskoy Differs With Yeltsin on Tactics, Not Strategy

MK2404114693 Moscow KURANTY in Russian 24 Apr 93 p 5

[Undated written interview with Russian Vice President Rutskoy by Lidiya Lukyanova: Aleksandr Rutskoy: "'Do Not Be Too Lazy To Have a Look at PRAVDA'"—first paragraph is introduction]

[Text] Seeing that A. Rutskoy complained that the democratic press is not giving him a chance to speak, we decided to help the vice president. We telephoned his office and asked whether Aleksandr Vladimirovich would give KURANTY an interview. Certainly, we were told and were requested to put the questions in writing, which we did. We had to call the office a great many times. We were assured that the text of the interview was ready and would be handed over to the editorial office soon ("in an hour," "in two hours," "by evening"). The text finally arrived on the 10th day, but the vice president's replies generated a considerable number of new questions, because Rutskoy's comments differed from many of his statements in recent days. We would have liked to have received the replies to the new questions from Aleksandr Vladimirovich personally. Alas, the KURANTY correspondent was not afforded this opportunity. We think that readers will also have many perplexed questions. Let that be on Rutskoy's conscience.

[Lukyanova] When did the differences of opinion between the vice president and president arise? And why?

[Rutskoy] From my viewpoint there are no fundamental differences between the president and the vice president regarding the strategy for Russia's development. That reforms are needed now is understood by the vast majority of the population, and only an extremely narrow group of orthodox people is harking back to the "good old days."

As regards the tactics of implementing reforms and consistency, however, I have said and I now say again that, having started the reforms with price liberalization and by going down the road of shock therapy, we have driven the country to destitution. It is not reform when almost 80 percent of the population have been thrown onto the brink of poverty. If anybody wants to find out exactly when I predicted everything that is happening here now and indicated the senselessness of shock therapy, do not be too lazy to have a look at the article "Is There a Way Out of the Crisis?," published in PRAVDA on 8 February 1992. (I just want to note that at that time not one of the so-called democratic newspapers could bring themselves to print my materials.)

[Lukyanova] Do you believe that these differences can be overcome? If so, what is needed to do this?

[Rutskoy] I am sure that many so-called differences are invented and arise because some people are "paraphrasing" my comments for the president, transforming them to the point of unrecognizability. While the president himself, it transpires, has no time to see his own vice president and have a talk. He sends me his ideas via news conferences, although we sit and work in the same building. And there is a direct telephone... Incidentally, name me just one country where the president believes he can ignore the vice president in this way.

Only one thing is therefore needed for mutual understanding—normal working communication rather than withdrawing into a shell and the president's ignoring a mass of documents, including on corruption, sent by the vice president.

[Lukyanova] The president and vice president were elected by the people jointly and indivisibly. But you have formed your own opinion on the forms and methods of implementing reforms. I do not dispute your right to have your own vision of reforms and to criticize the president. But are these actions compatible with holding the office of vice president from the viewpoint of morality and practice in civilized countries?

[Rutskoy] Let us start with the last point. In civilized countries the president and vice president are elected from the same party, but the situation was different here. B.N. Yeltsin, when inviting me to be his running mate, should also have recognized that he was entering into a coalition for the sake of winning the election and, accordingly, should have treated this with respect. But in actual fact G. Burbulis and certain other figures in the entourage tried to make me a "pocket vice president." It did not work, gentlemen.

I want to recommend that those who are now criticizing me reread the preelection leaflets with which they went around agitating for B.N. Yeltsin. Do they contain promises to impoverish the population, to have runaway inflation, to increase crime, to disintegrate the Soviet Union, and so on? I, unlike many people, remember well what I said at preelection rallies, and that is why I am not changing my line. I am for reforms and for transformations, but not at the expense of the tears, suffering, and blood of Russians.

Rutskoy Outlines Views on Country's Present, Future

PM2304151593 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 23 Apr 93 First Edition p 4

[Article by Vice President Aleksandr Rutskoy: "Halting the Rush to the Abyss. Time to Turn Back and Start Building. People Cannot Be Led to the Trough Again, Even If There Are Grains of Gold on the Bottom. Attack Me If You Like, But I Still Say We Must Start By Recreating An Effective State. We Must Not Play With Fire, Encouraging the Russian President Down a Road Which Will Lead to the End of Both Democracy and the Market. The State Can Only Be Stable When All Its Citizens Live in Security. Russia Needs A Strong Tax Service"]

[Text] Aleksandr Rutskoy's opponents are striving, particularly of late, to impress on Russian citizens that their vice president is a kind of crude, loudmouthed general who is by definition capable of little. Well, politicians have never been famed for the sterility of their manners, and methods like bending the truth, juggling with facts, or even downright slander are a traditional part of the sphere of activity of those who engage in politics. There are, however, facts such as a person's behavior or consistency in implementing certain policy goals, which everyone can use to form their own opinion without requiring outside prompting. The article by Aleksandr Rutskoy which we offer for your attention is, in our view, one such fact. It allows us to draw at least two conclusions—concerning the vice premier's [as published] political position, and his ability to interpret the highly complex position in the country and to propose constructive solutions.

Russia Cannot Be Reformed Through Political Violence

Without considering myself a major specialist on the economy, I would nonetheless like to share certain views which emerged on the basis of my experience of working with the agrarian sector, my participation in numerous discussions within the government and at the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet, and in the course of my meetings with prominent economists in this country and people involved in production.

There is now a widely held view that we have two options—to continue the "shock therapy" policy despite everything, or to restore total administrative control and wind up the reforms. In actual fact, each of these radical starting points will lead us to the abyss. The only way of avoiding that fate is for the leader (or leaders) to stop the rush, look back at the road we have traveled, and map out a better way. But this will require above all a different orientation in terms of values.

What do I have in mind? I am referring to a recent and seemingly secondary event, but one which for me illuminated the plans and preferences of the radical reformers like a shaft of light.

Ye. Gaydar has triumphantly celebrated the creation of a new association under his leadership. Yegor Timurovich himself is a man of science, but he has founded an association not to protect academics, students, workers, peasants, or pensioners. No, he has set up an association of private entrepreneurs. And he has acted logically: That was precisely the aim of his economic policy—to pave the way for a narrow group of millionaires. And that group has expressed its gratitude by contributing several billion rubles to the association's incorporation capital.

God knows, I am not against the formation of what is for us the new experience of a social stratum of businessmen. The country's new productive elite will largely be formed out of that group today. But they should be honest and guided not by a lust for profit, but by a sense of responsibility for their people's prosperity. "Entry" to this class should be open to all the country's active people—under no circumstances should it turn into a caste of mafiosi and bureaucrats.

I have been greatly impressed by two examples from foreign experience. In America in the last century, every—**every**—citizen was given the opportunity to acquire a sizeable tract of land in the West for nothing and become a farmer. In China 20 years ago, every—**every**—peasant family received the right to a family contract, to be allotted a tract of land within their cooperative, and to have free use of the produce it yielded. That is socially oriented capitalism. Equal opportunities for private initiative given to tens (and, in China, to hundreds) of millions of people.

As for Ye. Gaydar's reform, it was geared from the outset to the narrow group of people best prepared for the market, who had a unique opportunity to get rich quick—often through criminal trading operations—and to corrupt hungry officials who were just beginning to taste the joys of their power and influence.

So the first thing that needs to be done, in my view, is to reorient reform in social terms. Its logic should be built in such a way as to ensure that every step bears real fruit, and to ensure that people feel not only the burden of reform, but also its results.

The social reorientation of reform means something else too. We cannot lead people to the trough yet again, even if there are grains of gold on the bottom. The country's progress will only succeed if **Russia's citizens support the proposed strategy, believe in its viability, and clearly realize just what has to be done to create a modern democratic society and market.** We need to tell people honestly how much time we will need to get out of the crisis, and what stages of the transition to market relations will have to be passed through. People should consciously participate in the reform process and not be hostage to the decisions of others. Neither, however, should they live under the illusion that a kindlier government will be able to sharply improve their quality of life within a few months.

Having dealt with the very serious problems of the agro-industrial complex for the past year, I have shuddered each time Yu. Chernichenko took the rostrum. His cry is to expel from the land all those who do not want to become private farmers, and to destroy the former system of kolkhozes and sovkhozes at one fell swoop. He wants decollectivization using the same methods Stalin used for collectivization. I can clearly see that neither this speaker nor his followers have ever been part of the land like the peasants. That is why they find it so easy to argue about the destiny of more than one-third of the country's population.

In this connection I cannot fail to mention the Chinese: Just look at how delicately they have approached reform—they gave the peasants new opportunities, but did not chase them with bamboo sticks. Yet we are chasing our people—with hunger, inflation, and raucous propaganda—to God knows where. Look at how scared the radicals are of even uttering the word "capitalism." It sticks in their throat, yet they have long since spat out socialism. So they twist and turn—market (without capitalism!), democracy (without a parliament!), and freedom (without an opposition!).

Would it not be more sensible, instead of putting on a performance, to think seriously about what kind of market suits us best—in terms of our traditions, our mentality, and our economic conditions? I have not been abroad very much, but I have noticed how different markets are in the United States (where 300 monopolies rule the roost), in Japan (where it is hard to find out who owns companies), or in Austria with its mixed economy (where 50 percent of industry is still in the state's hands). Or maybe we should return to our own Russian capitalism with a protectionist role for the state and a sense of community spirit [obshchinnost]? I will not pass judgment, but I cannot fail to have my doubts.

Where do we start in making major amendments to the old course or, rather, the new course of reform? Attack me if you like, but I still say **we must start by recreating an effective state.** Not a state as all-suppressing monster, no—a modern democratic state guided by the rule of law rather than by tyranny. Is that difficult? Yes, it is. But I can see no other solution.

It is the state that should now be the leader of reform and the arbitrator between the legitimate interests of social groups and corporate claims. This is not a social idyll, but nor is it "every man for himself." It is a goal that is vitally necessary for us. In order to attain it we need to outline gradually the limits of state intervention in the economy and social life. But where the state is effective and has obtained a constitutional mandate to intervene, a clear-cut order should be established along with normal activity for all institutions.

It should be realized that the current decline in the state is the root of our problems in the economy and the cause of the failure of reform, not to mention the growth in crime and the impoverishment of the population. We should not have gone to the anarchic extreme whereby, ridding ourselves of total state control, we are eliminating basic state institutions almost completely. Here, as in everything, moderation and patient search are needed. We need painstaking work to organize the workings of the state mechanism. Of course, destroying things is easier. But that time has passed, it is time to start building...

A modern state needs, above all, popular support, otherwise it will again fall prey to bureaucrats and corruption. It can rely only on a vibrant and active democratic system, and on political stability. But unanimity is impossible in a vibrant society, particularly when it is in transition from one era to another. In this sense the acute struggle between positions and trends in present-day Russia is natural and inevitable. But, for all its acuteness, we need, in my view, to recognize the axiom without which reform will be doomed to failure, making the prospect of a "senseless and merciless Russian uprising [bunt]" increasingly realistic.

This axiom is that **the successful reform of Russia will be impossible if it involves political violence inflicted on the majority by the minority.** The pace and methods of transformation have to be acceptable to most of the population, with its mentality, value judgments, and ideas of justice. A state's policy is dictated by the will of its people, not by the romantic plans of wunderkinder.

In this connection I would like to say a few words about the upcoming 25 April nationwide vote. The referendum as such is not a tragedy—as some are claiming—but nor is it a panacea, as others believe. It is all a question of the kind of goals with which active political forces are linking it.

Unfortunately, it is already obvious that the referendum was poisoned with the aim of "sorting things out once and for all" with political opponents. That is why the tone in the campaign has been set by extremists who do not balk at employing street-corner abuse or cheap tricks like the episode over gas prices in Moscow. That is why statements are being made to the effect that the Constitution will be dumped provided there is a "positive" (?) outcome to the referendum.

At the same time, the hope of forming a democratic rule-of-law state—the only force capable of paving the way to an effective, fair, and socially oriented market—will be dumped too. The satirist A. Ivanov seriously stated that we need our own Pinochet. He is not worried about the fact that many of his satirist colleagues would end up behind barbed wire.

We must not play with fire, encouraging the Russian president down a road which will lead to the end of both democracy and the market—they are indivisible.

The referendum contains the danger that someone may try to use its results to justify illegality—but it also holds out the opportunity of accelerating the renewal we need so much. I am confident that the Russian people's healthy creative instinct will win out over the history of self-destruction and mutual destruction that grips a large part of the current political elite.

The Economic Alternative

Although the scope for choosing alternative programs has narrowed, the possibility of an evolutionary—and therefore less painful—transition to the market has not yet been lost. Whichever option we choose, though, we will have to balance on a knife edge: The country will not be able to withstand a continued production slump, unemployment above 4-5 percent, and inflation of the order of 30-40 percent a month.

Success here is only possible on the basis of a profound recognition of the actual situation. We need to finally realize that we are dealing with an economy that is in transition from an administrative edict system to a market system—and in the conditions of a vast multinational country. It will be impossible to overcome the crisis using measures of monetary and financial regulation alone, given the continuing predominance of state ownership, a monopolistic structure of production, and a system of universal social tutelage. We need a comprehensive system of measures to ensure stabilization and, at the same time, to highlight the priority "areas of impact" [zony vozdeystviya] which should be the locomotives to drive the economy out of the crisis.

The first and mandatory condition for this is the restoration of controllability. Controllability, rather than the Gosplan [State Planning Committee] with its functions of carrying out strict and often irrational distribution. Regulation, programming, and direct planning happen in all states, irrespective of their system. It is already quite obvious that, without control [upravleniye] in the transitional period, we will inevitably end up with a chaotic market of a semicolonial type. Nature abhors a vacuum. If the state fails to take control at the country level, its levers will be seized by others—including "shadowy" figures and out-and-out mafia structures, which are interested not in development but solely in turning a profit at someone else's expense.

Within the transitional period framework the state must be the leader of the reforms and set their course. It cannot shirk its responsibility for the fate of enterprises and those working at them, just as state enterprises cannot simply cast off their responsibility to the state. The reform of the state management system must provide above all for the formation of a new type of responsibility and the reestablishment of "headquarters" tasking functions and normal executive discipline.

It is equally important to identify the "fracture points." Now that we are experiencing an enormous investment famine, the resources that become available must be placed wherever they can be most effective. Food supply is at the top of the list, of course. Not food supply in general, but mainly the processing of agricultural products (an area where average losses stand at 50 percent).

Our second main economic "trump card" is conversion. It could increase our export potential rather quickly and give a boost to economic growth, by ensuring the export of machinery and equipment and also the reequipping of our raw material sectors.

There will be no progress unless real support is given to small and medium producers. As long as it is more profitable to be a middleman than a producer there will be no significant changes in the market. One might consider a **"special support arrangement"** for entrepreneurs in the production sphere for a period of three-five years, involving financial benefits and an appropriate legal mechanism.

I particularly want to highlight a matter that is being increasingly discussed today both by politicians and economists—**regional policy**. It is perfectly clear that the old system of relations between the center and members of the Federation has collapsed and a new one is only just taking shape, moreover on occasions there is a clear drift in the direction of the "Novo-Ogarevo current," which could wind up in the maelstrom.

It is obviously necessary to refrain both from courting the regions for political ends and from wanting to concentrate the management of all processes in Moscow. Incidentally, I might remind you that, despite all the assurances, around 75 percent of the expenditure part of the budget in 1992 was concentrated in the center (in the USSR this figure was around 60 percent!). The solution to this is budget reform which would clearly divide tax sources and responsibility between the Federation and the regions.

Immediate Measures

Production Slump. We need a "controllable slump" policy, which would primarily ensure the survivability of vitally necessary spheres of production and the minimum necessary level of social benefits—power supply, transportation, and production of foodstuffs and medicines. Naturally, we cannot talk about automatically supporting all producers—there are neither funds nor potential to do this, nor is it even economically necessary.

Thus, we can single out a "nucleus" in the economy where the slump must be halted as soon as possible using the most energetic economic and administrative state measures. We could use for this purpose the anticrisis experience of the United States, Germany, and Japan. Here it is possible to conclude state contracts for the production of end products and services backed by targeted finance and, whenever necessary, by allocation of the required material resources.

In order to maintain and boost scientific and technical potential in the manufacture of high tech output, it would be expedient to put the emphasis on creating major industrial concerns capable of becoming the "hotbeds of growth." Having concentrated the limited investment resources and amalgamated the enterprises involved in the production of end products, they would be capable of countering the slump, ensuring real conversion and positive structural changes, and entering the world market. Analysis shows that, if this approach is adopted, it is perfectly possible to win one's share in the world's high tech market (aerospace technology, telecommunications, shipbuilding, electrical engineering, and so on). Such a surge could act as a locomotive for the entire economy, but targeted state support is necessary to ensure it.

The slump in production cannot be halted without the maintenance of demand by the population. In its turn, this would require indexation of savings, which is already becoming the topic of practical talks. But, in order to avoid fanning the flames of inflation, this must be done on the basis of thorough consideration without allowing the entire money supply to be squandered on current consumption.

Curbing inflation. Nothing can be done here without imposing elementary order in the sphere of credit and money policy and the banking system. After all, we have reached the point where we have no idea of the real quantity of money in circulation, while the speed of circulation is such that money is devalued by one-half by the time one single cycle is completed. It is necessary to create as soon as possible a computerized system of reciprocal settlements between banks and within their structures.

We need a fundamentally new mechanism to determine the ruble's exchange rate. It should probably be in the hands of the Central Bank rather than the foreign currency exchange, which offers tremendous opportunities for speculative games. Of course, much here will depend on whether we could successfully ensure control over the determination of the ruble's exchange rate and set up a special fund for its stabilization.

For the time being we will evidently be unable to avoid a temporary regulation of prices for a narrow range of highly monopolized categories of output which determine the structure of prices and the rate of inflation in the first place (fuel, metals). Much could be achieved by intersector agreements on prices and wages. One necessary prerequisite would be a sensible financial, credit, and budget policy based on clearly defined and realistic priorities.

Literally two words about foreign currency control. Many exporters are selling natural resources—oil, gas, metal, timber—at obviously reduced prices not in order to gain market positions but in order to earn "commission payments" which are deposited in the personal accounts of parties to the deals. This is why, at the present stage, we need to centralize the exports of strategic raw materials and restore without fail the ruined system of statistics and accountability.

Structural policy. The strategic goal here is the social reorientation of the economy, the formation of a developed consumer sector, and the achievement of balance in production. In my view, the most important role in the implementation of structural transformations must be played by state programs which clearly reflect the economy's turnabout in the direction of man — programs for housing, foodstuffs, health care, nature and the environment, and production of consumer durables. This turnabout should be backed up by conversion programs envisaging the creation of means of production for small and medium businesses and the development of high tech production units. At the same time I would like to emphasize that, while pursuing the economy's demilitarization, we have no right to go to the other extreme and forget the country's real defense needs.

Agroindustrial complex. I have had numerous occasions to speak and write on this topic, and will therefore highlight only the basic theses. First, earliest possible support for the processing complex within the agroindustrial complex. Second, an end to the practice of administrative persecution of sovkhozes and kolkhozes. Calls for the accelerated privatization of farming in the country without adequate resources for this purpose would only lead to the collapse of the existing system. Let me emphasize again the need to create a system of state and joint-stock land banks which would become conductors of the state's financial policy and would make it possible, within brief periods, to build up actually in the countryside the respectable funds needed for the deepening of reform. Finally, a major role could be played by the abolition of value added tax on products intended to meet agriculture's material and technical needs.

Foreign economic activity. I do not call for a return to state monopoly in foreign trade, but I do advocate the creation of an effective system to control exports and imports, which would enable the state to receive budget revenues punctually and would supply information on what is being shipped to the world market or brought in for the domestic market, and by whom.

We need to stimulate exports, not so much raw material, but industrial exports. Specifically, we need a preferential credit system for the exports of finished products, primarily machine building output. Coupled with simultaneous changes in the structure of imports to increase the proportion represented by equipment, technologies, and investment goods. It would be useful to introduce differentiated import duty rates, making provision for preferential treatment of individual categories of imported goods, both semimanufactures and raw materials, which are important for satisfying the critical demands of the economy and its retooling.

Social policy. It must be oriented primarily toward ensuring proper living conditions for all population groups. In this process, priority must be given to the working man who must earn as much as is necessary to meet his family's normal needs. But wages should be earned only by working, by high-quality work at that. The market should play its role in this regard.

But money is only one side of the coin. The other side involves actually supplying the population with the necessary goods and services. This means primarily maintaining the prices of housing and consumer durables at an affordable level. It is necessary to urgently create conditions for housing construction which would be acceptable to the majority of workers. At the same time, it is necessary to restore the system of consumer credit for Russian-made consumer durables.

Economic reintegration. Despite all the ambitions pursued by politicians in the "era of sovereignization," we are becoming more and more convinced with each passing day of the need for the closest possible links between Russia's economy and the former USSR republics. We are right in saying that the restoration of broken ties is one of the most important reserves for overcoming the crisis.

In my view, Russia's main task is to actively move toward the creation of a fully fledged economic union between those states which are really interested in it. We must take the initiative in this regard. Maybe we need to start moving toward a common market which would envisage the implementation of joint economic strategy of reforms, pursuit of a unified credit and emission policy, and free movement of capital, labor resources, goods, and services. There is no doubt that success in the cause of reintegration will enjoy tremendous support among the people who have now been dispersed by politicians to their various national homes.

Combating State Crime

The implementation of the aforementioned provisions is objectively impossible unless we apply the brake to the accelerated criminalization of the economy and political life. A state can be stable only when all its citizens live in safety. Therefore, if we do not change very soon, not just our attitude to, but also our methods of counteracting the criminal world, Russian society will inevitably become a criminal society. What is needed for this?

First. Gather all law enforcement and other agencies engaged in protecting the intrerests of Russia and its citizens into a concentrated strike force, removing superfluous interdepartmental barriers. The first step in this direction has been taken. By edict of the president of Russia, the Interdepartmental Commission of the Russian Federation Security Council has been set up as an organ coordinating the drafting and implementation of federal programs aimed at safeguarding the rights, freedoms, and personal safety of citizens and combating organized crime and corruption. I recently reported to the Supreme Soviet on the initial results of its work. Similar commissions should be set up at the regional level, too, to coordinate the fight against crime in oblasts, krays, and rayons.

Second. To combat crime effectively, especially its forms which are new to Russia—organized, economic crime—an appropriate legislative base is needed. It is necessary to ensure that the over 30 draft laws already prepared on questions of combating crime, including the Laws "On State Service" and "On Combating Corruption," are adopted by the Russian Supreme Soviet as a priority. They will make it possible to stop corruption in the state apparatus, which is the most dangerous phenomenon now for Russia and its economic interests.

We must rapidly draft and ratify by decree of the president of the Russian Federation a program to combat corruption, conclude treaties with all CIS countries to provide legal assistance in this struggle, and set up an interstate structure, a kind of "CIS Interpol," to detect and expose corrupt groups, "roving gangsters," figures in the narcotics business, and arms dealers. Taken together with the laws on the state border, the customs code, customs tariffs, amendements to the Criminal Code, and so forth, they will form a package of laws which will make it possible to stop the orgy of crime and pillaging of the country. Delay here only plays into the hands of the plunderers who are tearing Russia apart.

Third. Passing a law is not enough, it has actually to work. The people will support all measures against criminals if they see that they really guarantee the safety of the individual and society. Therefore, the government should immediately draft and submit to the Supreme Soviet a comprehensive, coordinated program to strengthen law and order and legality—not a declaration, but a program backed up by real resources. Everything has to be provided for and calculated here: Cadres, material and technical backup, finance, and measures to provide early warning of unlawful behavior, particularly among minors. The All-Russian Conference of Law Enforcement Agencies supplied more than enough material for this.

Fourth. Russia needs a high-powered taxation service. According to expert estimates, up to 30 percent of the income of enterprises and citizens in developed countries is concealed from the tax authorities. And this despite their tough system and daunting penalties. **Our losses, according to certain data, represent up to 40 percent of the tax section of the budget.** I am sure that these figures do not reflect the reality of the situation, if only for the single reason that no effective system of tax collection has been set up. When the State Taxation Service is operating at full capacity, organized crime will have its financial support removed from under it and the budget of the country and the climate in society will improve.

Fifth. The government must adopt forthwith legal, economic, and administrative measures which protect the interests of the state in the foreign economic sphere. The illegal siphoning of billions in foreign currency abroad must be stopped without delay, and Russia's Federal Currency and Export Control Service, which was essentially set up as a blind and whose activity has been sabotaged by the government for almost 18 months now, must finally start working properly.

Sixth. The sources of a purchaser's money are checked throughout the world. We are alone in asking no one anything. Meanwhile the privatization of federal property has started up in our country, and it is being used as a means to launder and legalize shady capital. The Finance Ministry and the Central Bank must revive as quickly as possible the practice of a declaration of incomes in excess of a specific set threshold.

Seventh. Order and calm must be restored to our cities. One measure is to recruit the population for this on a new, purely voluntary basis. We are not talking about restoring the people's militias, but neither should we completely discard our experience and the experience of other developed countries which have successfully enlisted their citizens in tackling this task.

Many "servants of the people," particularly those who have their "snout in the trough," seek to interpret my statements on the need to restore law and order as a call to settle scores with political adversaries and as virtually a call to restore Stalinist tyranny. This is a standard way of laying the blame on others. I am above all advocating the enhancement of the effectiveness of the institutions of a democratic state—the courts, the Prosecutor's Office, and the legislative base—rather than the pursuit of individuals. A normal law enforcement system should operate. It is understandable that many people in power who have gotten rich out of the disintegration of the state-legal system do not like this.

Russia today really does stand at the crossroads. And if we allow Russia to proceed along the route of a free-for-all market and the destruction of the whole system of national and spiritual values and statehood, then ruin really could lie in store for it in the near future. There is still a chance for us to alter this ruinous course, and we must take it!

Kotenkov Accuses Rutskoy, Stepankov of Illegalities

LD2304123993 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1028 GMT 23 Apr 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Yuriy Vdovin]

[Text] Moscow, 23 Apr—Aleksandr Rutskoy's speech at the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet session was made for purely political purposes; it was not a speech by the chairman of the interdepartmental commission concerned about the struggle against crime and corruption, Aleksandr Kotenkov, head of the Russian Federation president's state and legal directorate, told an ITAR-TASS correspondent.

Kotenkov said that "in fact, Aleksandr Rutskoy made use of his powers as chairman of the interdepartmental commission, which has access to documents of any department." In his words, the procurator general, who is also a member of the interdepartamental commission, was aware of those facts as well. However, "instead of acting upon this information in accordance with the corresponding legal procedure—instituting criminal proceedings and setting checkups—Valentin Stepankov kept silent and waited to see what would happen," Kotenkov remarked.

In the view of the head of the state and legal directorate, "Rutskoy, whose commission includes the procurator general, the chairman of the Supreme Court, and the ministers of all the 'power' departments, should have organized a corresponding check and handed the case to the Procuracy." "According to our current legislation," Kotenkov stressed, "a person who has information about a committed crime but conceals this information is an accomplice."

Regarding the facts cited in the vice president's speech, Kotenkov said: "There is nothing to hide. It is indisputable that there is corruption, and on a very large scale at that, but only the court can declare a man a criminal." "The majority of the materials which Rutskoy got from the control directorate, the Security Ministry, and the Ministry of Internal Affairs are actual evidence materials from criminal cases which are under investigation," Kotenkov said, and "to make public actual evidence of investigations currently being dealt with is not just a mere breach of the law; it causes colossal damage to the investigation, and the evidence already made public loses its strength as evidence during court proceedings."

Kotenkov said that the government commission headed by Sergey Shakhray, which was set up on 19 April, has already "completely refuted allegations about the privatization of the ice breaker fleet, and the transformation of the Murmansk and Nakhodka ports into joint-stock companies was carried out in strict accordance with the law and without violations." Besides, "a proportion of the information cited by Rutskoy has not been confirmed" in the cases, for which criminal proceedings have already been instigated, he concluded.

Rutskoy Allegations on Western Group Corruption Refuted

LD2404195593 Moscow Ostankino Television First Channel Network in Russian 1120 GMT 24 Apr 93

[Interview with A.N. Mityukhin, first deputy commander in chief of the Western Group of Forces; A.N. Ilyushenko, head of the Control Directorate of the Russian president's administration; and V.A. Koshelev, deputy commander in chief of the Western Group of Forces, by correspondent Aleksandr Ukhov; from the "Topical Interview" program—recorded]

[Text] [Ukhov] Our "Topical Interview" today is devoted to the speech by Russian Vice President Aleksandr Vladimirovich Rutskoy at the Supreme Soviet session. In his speech Aleksandr Vladimirovich Rutskoy accused the Russian Army of corruption, and the bulk of the criticism was leveled at the Western Group of Forces. How justified are these accusations?

[Mityukhin] Since the beginning of last year, 1992, there started to appear in the media—first in Germany and then in Russia—articles in which the authors, without any proof, accused the leadership of the Western Group of Forces of theft and corruption.

It must be said that this ground swell of unfounded fabrication comes as no surprise to us. It regularly happens that, as soon as the political process—the political process both in Russia and in Germany—becomes exacerbated, then the latest helping of mud and lies about the Western Group of Forces appears in the media.

Practical considerations require that the use of the Western Group of Forces as an instrument in political games should stop. Lies concerning the Western Group of Forces sap the troops' morale and psychological potential, undermine the standing of the Western Group of Forces in the eyes of the German public, and make it harder to carry out the main tasks by diverting the leadership of the Western Group of Forces from performing the substantial tasks involved in moving the troops onto Russian territory.

All the activities of the Western Group of Forces, and especially those of its leadership, are in full view of the officials of Germany, the leadership of the laender, and the Bundeswehr, which have never reproached us for a single case of corruption or blatant theft. What is more, knowing the situation, they are happy to cooperate with us and are satisfied with the affairs of the Western Group of Forces.

A statement yesterday by General Foertsch, the head of the Bundeswehr's department that liaises with the Western Group of Forces—I will read it out—said: On the whole, we have very good cooperation. We are satisfied with the state of it.

[Ukhov] Aleksey Nikolayevich, please tell me, is your monitoring board of the president's administration taking any specific actions at the present time to check the information set forth in the speech made by the Russian vice president at the Supreme Soviet session?

[Ilyushenko] First, I have to say that the arguments which were cited by the vice president need to be seriously checked. At the present time, owing to the fact that the cases are serious ones, a governmental commission has been set up under the leadership of Deputy Prime Minister Sergey Shakhray, of which I am also a member. It has been set up to check on all the cases, I stress, not only the cases of the Western Group of Forces and others, but all the cases that were set forth by the vice president. Today a team is almost ready to go on location, but I would like to tell you yet again that unfortunately the speech the vice president made before the referendum—in my view—goes beyond what was said at the session and at the session of the interdepartmental commission before that. Unfortunately, arguments that are too categorical heat up the people who are to vote at the referendum in our country on 25 April.

Unchecked—I stress unchecked—facts that have been cited and require additional verification may be perceived incorrectly.

I am profoundly convinced that all the arguments should be verified and a fundamental judicial assessment should be made of all the cases. But politics cannot be intermingled with this, since nothing is that simple. We have been through the thirties, so to speak, and we knew, or rather know, how all that ended. Today we do not have the right to accuse anyone indiscriminately before checking those arguments in a calm, normal, working, businesslike situation.

This also applies to the Western Group of Forces. I think the government commission that has been set up under the supervision of Sergey Shakhray will definitely study 10 times over all the arguments put forward by the vice president and will make an assessment of them.

[Ukhov] Is the Russian president making observations on how the committee set up is operating?

[Ilyushenko] Yes, certainly. Immediately after the speech by the vice president to the session of the Supreme Soviet an instruction was issued by Russian President Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin, in accordance with which the monitoring board of the president's administration and the ministers of security and internal affairs have been charged with verifying all the arguments cited by the vice president and making a weekly—I stress—report on the state of affairs in this direction to the president personally.

[Ukhov] Viktor Alekseyevich, one might say that it was your subunit that was subjected to particular criticism in the Western Group of Forces. How serious are these accusations? I am citing the Russian vice president: More than 20 buildings, that is, 20 buildings and an area of more than 10,000 square meters, and more than 70 facilities, houses, shops, warehouses, and so forth were handed over to a certain (Korovin Nikolay Ivanovich).

[Koshelev] By looking at the figures and then the instructions, one can see the seriousness of the accusations. We were issued instructions by the deputy minister of defense and directives by the minister of defense. A lease agreement has been signed with the Academy of People's Culture dating from 22 October 1992 on the temporary utilization of 20 buildings when they become free near the Berlin collective farm, on the condition that the lease requirements only come into force after the academy has redecorated the premises at its own expense. On 17 April the Academy of People's Culture only wanted one building, a detached house.

[Ukhov] Let us get this right: This Academy of the People's Culture is, for all that, our Russian academy.

[Koshelev] It is the Russian Academy of People's Culture. By decision of the Government of the Russian Federation of 23 March 1993, signed by Comrade Chernomyrdin, chairman of the Council of Ministers, the activity of the academy in this direction has been approved and instructions have been given to the State Committee for the Management of State Property to determine the form of utilization of the premises of the Western Group of Forces which have been vacated. The issue is currently being dealt with.

[Ukhov] What about the 70 facilities, houses, shops, and warehouses?

[Koshelev] As for the 70 facilities handed over to a certain (Korovin), the representative of the little-known commercial structures (Oka) and (Mokat), let me say this: The sole facility at the disposal of Lieutenant-General Sadovnikov, former head of the main trade directorate, was indeed handed over to the joint Russian-German firm (Mokat) in April 1991. None of the other buildings and structures destined for (Korovin) were handed over, although it had been intended to make use of the vacated accommodation. However, by decisions of the commander in chief, in December 1991 and November 1992 all these buildings, which had been intended for the use of the joint enterprises, were in the stipulated way handed over to the German side.

[Ukhov] Aleksey Nikolayevich, I have one more question: When do you suppose the work of your commission will end and when will we be able to make the results public?

[Ilyushenko] You mean in respect to the Western Group of Forces? I think that within a month at the most we will be able to provide specific information. I do not think that it will take long.

[Mityukhin] Nevertheless, the General Procuracy of our Russian Federation must put a final end to all these fabrications and utterances and the commissions....

[Ukhov, interrupting] You are not afraid of the commission?

[Mityukhin] No, we are not afraid. The Russian Procuracy, various government commissions, and the Supreme Soviet commissions which have repeatedly operated among us will do their work and, as they say, dot the i's and allow the Western Group of Forces to calmly carry out their main task.

Shokhin Disputes Rutskoy Claim on Capital Flight

PM2604094393 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 24 Apr 93 First Edition p 2

[Report by Aleksey Portanskiy: "Five Times Less Capital Has Drained From Country"]

[Text] Is it possible that hard currency and raw and strategic materials worth around $17 billion have drained from the country, as vice president Aleksandr Rutskoy said in his recent speech? IZVESTIYA turned to Aleksandr Shokhin, Russian Federation Government vice premier, for clarification of this matter, which has been bothering the public.

"It would be pointless to deny that the 'flight of capital' from Russia is a fact," Shokhin said. "This phenomenon is typical of countries going through a period of high inflation and political instability. The question is, what kind of resources are draining 'illegally' from the country.

"According to State Committee for Statistics figures, in 1992 exports amounted to $40 billion, around $28 billion of it in cash. Some $36.9 billion were spent on imports, more than $18 billion in cash.

"So there was a favorable balance of $10 billion in trade transactions involving cash, which could be seen as 'flight of capital.' But, at the same time, the bulk of this sum went abroad for entirely legal reasons. In fact, according to the bank accounts, there was an increase of $6.5 billion in commercial banks' foreign assets. Not counting the invisible exports and imports balance, the 'illegal' draining of capital amounts to no more than $3.5 billion. Assessments made by more complex methods, on the basis of the Russian balance of payments for last year, indicate a similar figure.

"Of course, this sum, although it is several times smaller than the frightening figures cited by the vice president, does worry us," Shokhin said. "For that very reason active work is now being done to set up a currency control mechanism in the country. Its main agents, the Central Bank and the State Customs Committee, with the participation of the Foreign Economic Relations Ministry and Finance Ministry, have devised a procedure for the control of exports amd expenditure on them, which will come into effect 1 July. Further steps are also planned."

Nature of Rutskoy Revelations Viewed

PM2604100193 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 23 Apr 93 First Edition p 2

[Article by Mikhail Gurtovoy: "Fabrications and Gossip as Tool of Political Struggle"]

[Text] While some people are waxing ironic over the suitcases full of exposures from Aleksandr Rutskoy's report at the Supreme Soviet and others are trying to form in citizens an image of a hero who has defeated the mafia hydra, the president has instructed the law enforcement organs to investigate each episode of the sensational expose.

I am sure this work will be very easy. After all the majority of Rutskoy's revelations are known to everyone. The president's monitoring administration and the working groups of the government commission for combating corruption, which I headed until recently, have already done virtually all of this. Naturally, the investigation was conducted with the participation of specialists from the ministries of security and internal affairs.

Thus, the memorandum on abuses in the Western Group of Forces was prepared back in the fall by inspectors from the monitoring administration. The investigation was very complex. It was conducted by them under conditions of tough opposition, frequently with a risk to their lives. The inspectors, naturally, had no armored "Mercedes," no personal bodyguard. But they proved cases of abuse and insisted on the dismissal or demotion of a number of generals. That the measures taken are quite inadequate for what has been done is another matter. And if Rutskoy had emphasized that point his speeches would have merited only approval. But to all appearances Rutskoy has other tasks. First, to grow his own laurels on soil which has been broken up by someone else. But that would still be a semi-victory. Something else is worse.

The vice president is trying to turn criminal episodes against those at whose initiative they were revealed and investigated. Take the emeralds story. Rutskoy accused Gaydar of signing authorization for the transfer of 30 kg of emeralds to a joint venture, but I think the vice president knows very well that the emeralds affair was begun back in Gorbachev's time by the secret union Ministry of Medium Machine Building and Gaydar was put into a mess not of his own making. Moreover, it was Gaydar who ordered the investigation of all details of this deal and when violations of the contract were discovered on the part of the foreign partner, the release of emeralds was halted.

It is not at second hand that I know this, I myself presented the directive on the embargo to the committee on precious metals. Incidentally, there is not a word about it in the report. Yet it was with the connivance of that committee that very hasty decisions were almost taken regarding both emeralds and diamonds. But that committee is engaged in outright flirting with the parliamentary commissions, which want to make the country's main depository subordinate to the Supreme Soviet again and are consequently inviolate for Rutskoy. In general this approach—"our people can do what they want"—can be clearly traced in the report: Nowhere is there a word about deputies' abuses. Yet checks locally have shown that the deputies are shamelessly and universally lobbying commercial structures and taking part in their activity. Again it is not from hearsay and not only from documents that I know this. During my work in the government apparatus I had to parry hundreds of the most unscrupulous deputies' pleas to give some privileges or other to dubious firms.

After Rutskoy's report there was a lot of speculation—why had he failed to hand over to the prosecutor's office matters with which he was familiar, why, finally, did the general prosecutor, who is a member of the interdepartmental commission, not initiate criminal proceedings, as is laid down, when he saw violations of the law? I think they would have been pleased to try to annoy their political opponents, but the trouble was that there were no laws making it possible to punish economic crimes of the 1992 and 1993 model. The Supreme Soviet is quite unable to find the time to adopt them.

And so we have examined two methods used by Rutskoy in compiling the report. First, using facts from an investigation against those initiated the investigation, arrogating the laurels of a fighter against corruption; and, second, completely bypassing involvement in the abuses of his new political allies, those who gave him a social mandate for sensation. That such a mandate was given is borne out if only by the fact that deputies had gotten television time in advance, without even having heard the report, for its repeated broadcasting.

The third method consists of overt lies. Rutskoy has already been caught over the episode of the allegedly squandered gold when it was proven that in 1992 for the first time in many years Russia increased its gold reserve.

Rutskoy also put his foot in it over the story of the port of Nakhodka. Nor did he want to investigate the situation involving the sale of strategic materials by the state reserve. For instance, 500 tonnes of cobalt included in the sum he named, as soon as world market prices fell, were returned to Russia at our insistence. I should like to suggest that Rutskoy was yet again simply let down by his own incompetence. But all the above-mentioned episodes were within the framework of blood-curdling but utterly unsubstantiated figures.

It seems to me that the method used to compile the report is reminiscent of the memorandums with which one Aksenov, taken as an adviser by Rutskoy, used to bombard the government. Aksenov, deported from Sweden with the connivance of Burbulis, created a secret control group under the government. It then turned out that he alone belonged to the group. And on behalf of this mythical group he tried to do nothing more nor less than channel the country's foreign economic activity in the direction he wanted and even issued instructions to ambassadors. Mingling rumors and gossip with abuses which had actually been uncovered, Aksenov groundlessly accused those he did not like of being criminals. Staffers in foreign trade firms complained that through him valuable information was being leaked to foreign commercial firms and that was resulting in enormous losses. The sale of valuable secret documents is linked with his name. When his activity in the government was put to an end Aksenov was welcomed with open arms as a fighter against corruption first by the Supreme Soviet and then by Rutskoy. So that I am hardly wrong in recognizing a familiar style in the report.

This is not the first time that Rutskoy has committed an act of betrayal unprecedented in world practice—attacking a man with whom he came to power. And he does indeed have grounds for supposing that since he got away with it before he will get away with it now. The vice president has made a mess of all the sectors which have been assigned him so far and now you can see he is being appointed to struggle against corruption. He is being appointed obviously for opportunist reasons, counter to expediency and morality. And since that is so, why not use this chance to rid himself of the "vice" prefix.

At the same time the "expose speech" and the mention of the 12 suitcases of compromising material were probably aimed not only at influencing the results of the referendum. A file of this kind and scale can easily become a universal instrument of political influence irrespective of how events develop. Actually, not only political influence. The shadow of the suitcases of exposes could ensure their possessor considerable lucrative respect from those who were not named in the report but who do indeed have something to fear.

Yeltsin Appoints Three New Officials

LD2404101693 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 0929 GMT 24 Apr 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent]

[Text] Moscow, 24 Apr (ITAR-TASS)—President Boris Yeltsin made several new appointments yesterday.

Yevgeniy Bychkov was appointed chairman of the Russian Federation Committee for Precious Metals and Precious Stones; Vladimir Gusev was made head of the Russian Federation State Tax Service; and Anatoliy Kuranov has become deputy general director of the Federal Government Communications and Information Agency [Federalnoye agentstvo pravitelstvennoy svyazi I informatsii].

Yeltsin 'Instruction' Turns Over Church Property

LD2304160193 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1335 GMT 23 Apr 93

[Text] Moscow, 23 Apr (ITAR-TASS)—Russian President Boris Yeltsin signed an instruction today on handing over ecclesiastical buildings and territories adjacent to them which are the property of the Federation to religious organizations. This was reported by the press service of the president.

In accordance with this document the government of the country has been instructed to prepare within a period of two months a list of ecclesiastical buildings and other property which should be handed over to religious organizations in the first instance.

Anti-Yeltsin Rally Held in Moscow 23 Apr

LD2304171293 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1615 GMT 23 Apr 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Vladimir Shevel]

[Text] Moscow, 23 Apr—Several hundred demonstrators gathered this evening outside the walls of the Russian Parliament bearing slogans in defense of the power of the soviets and the Constitution of the Russian Federation. The "Union of Oficers" public organization organized the rally. Representatives of the "Union of Officers," of the political soviet of the National Salvation Front, the "Working Russia" movement, and a number of other organizations in opposition to the president and the government addressed the rally, calling on the demonstrators to take an active part in the Russian nationwide referendum on 25 March [as received], and to cast their votes expressing no confidence in the president of Russia and the socio-economic policy of the government he heads.

The hour-long rally ended with volunteers signing up in a voluntary people's militia, which is allegedly intended to defend the constitutional order should the "Yeltsinites" make an attempt upon it after the referendum.

Isakov, Terekhov Named Heads of Activist Committee

MK2304103693 Moscow KURANTY in Russian 23 Apr 93 p 1

[Pavel Zakharov report: "It Is Boring, Gentlemen"]

[Text] **At long last, they have found an executive post for People's Deputy Vladimir Isakov, too.**

As announced at yesterday's press conference organized by the Russian Unity parliamentary opposition bloc, he has become chairman of the so-called Public Committee for the Protection of the Constitution and the Constitutional System, and Lieutenant Colonel S. Terekhov has been appointed his deputy.

From whom is this committee going to protect the Constitution and the constitutional system? From the president who is allegedly preparing a coup, it appears. In a bid to prevent it, the committee members, who incidentally have entered into an alliance with the omnipresent Vladimir Zhirinovskiy, have resolved to use all measures including civil disobedience and resistance. The precise meaning of the latter was never defined despite persistent questions from journalists.

Addressing the press conference, National Salvation Front leader Ilya Konstantinov announced that the "march of the indignant people" set for today would take its planned route despite objections from Moscow Mayor Yuriy Luzhkov, who offered an alternative option.

It was generally rather boring at the press conference. Nothing new.

Presidential Administration Head Interviewed

LD2404165693 Moscow Programma Radio Odin Network in Russian 0730 GMT 23 Apr 93

[Interview with Sergey Filatov, head of the Russian presidential administration, by Vladimir Konyukhov; from the "Novaya Volna" program]

[Excerpts] [Konyukhov] [passage omitted] Our guest today is Sergey Aleksandrovich Filatov, one of the leading representatives of the President's team. [passage omitted] Now I will introduce Novaya Volna's guest. A little while ago Sergey Aleksandrovich was first deputy chairman of the Supreme Soviet to Khasbulatov, but within a few months he was head of the Russian president's administration.

Sergey Aleksandrovich, quite often one can hear—it has been said in the papers—that immense power is concentrated in your hands. In particular, you have on more than one occasion conducted sessions of the Presidential Council. In this connection, your great influence on the president has been mentioned quite a lot. Is this really the case? One other point to elaborate upon on this question: How strong, generally, is the influence of the president's retinue?

[Filatov] You have asked lot of questions there. First, a great deal of power—all power—resides with the president. That is the first thing, and it is only on the president's instruction that we fulfill those tasks which need to be fulfilled in order to ensure that the presidential structure and the structures of executive power operate effectively.

The second question on the retinue and its influence on the president: Well, naturally, you will understand that the president requires a backup, just as the Supreme Soviet does—technical, organizational, informational, and analytical. All this needs to be provided because the president must have insight and his own point of view. He must have two-way communication on executive matters, he must be able to see where and what corrective measures must be made, and the main thing, he must always be able to see a long-term program, one which he can propose to society and on which all the executive structures can work. Accordingly, the legislative body must ensure the fulfilment of this long-term directive.

All this makes up what they call the president's retinue. Right? That is what they call it today.

[Konyukhov] Right. It is not only that they call it that, but that is what the gossips call it, as well.

[Filatov] Yes, but this does not mean that it is five, ten, or a hundred people, a thousand people; these are people who work in this presidential structure, and the structures of executive power in general, is the president's team. Attempts to single out the president and attempts to single out certain individuals, certain presidential circles, are linked with certain political intentions or aims which today are becoming very evident and clear. It is constantly a question of power, and of attempts for a constitutional, say, or a legal coup. Because you and I have begun this program, I believe that the fundamental issue which should be pointed out here regarding the situation which has been building up in the country for a year now—it began, if you recall, from the Sixth Congress of People's Deputies—is people's attitudes to the reforms. That is the main thing. It is on this basis that the team is being formed. Here I could not even begin to separate into legislative and executive power precisely the teams which support the reforms; they are there in the legislative power and in the structures of law-enforcement bodies, legal bodies, and in executive structures. There are also people opposed to these reforms, but they also have their own supporters.

[Konyukhov] For my part I add that it is on the same principle that public opinion is shaped. There are people who support the reforms ...

[Filatov, interrupting] Absolutely right.

[Konyukhov] And there are people who are opposed—fundamentally opposed—to these reforms.

[Filatov] Yes, that is why the referendum which takes place the day after tomorrow must answer the main fundamental question. The question is: Do we support the course of reforms in the state, the course of democracy, the course of freedom, the course of independence, so to speak, the course of a free economy, and freedom of the individual and society? If we do, the answer will be yes.

[Konyukhov] So, one could rephrase what you said along the following lines: Do we want a new Russia or do we intend to seek an amended version of the old system?

[Filatov] I think it is no longer a question of seeking. It is already quite clear that the leaders of the opposition team want a return to the old system, to the totalitarian regime. When you bear in mind that large elements of the opposition are Communist elements, the ones which are reconstituting themselves today, when you hear what their leaders are saying, I, for one, feel extremely alarmed and see very great danger in what lies behind all this.

[Konyukhov] Well, we will talk a bit more about alarm and danger later. I remind you that with us in the studio we have Sergey Aleksandrovich Filatov, head of the Russian president's administration. [passage omitted]

[Filatov, reading written question from listener] Mr. Filatov, what do you think of traitors? That is from Frolov in Moscow.

[Konyukhov] That is a very broad question.

[Filatov] Yes, I can answer it in full. I make it my business to understand any person I meet. I respect opponents. I respect different views. I try to understand them. This really is very important in our life. Naturally, however, I take an extremely dim view of people who ambush you, who strike you from behind. I regard them just the same way as you would, I think.

Unfortunately, I cannot answer the next question, question number three, because I have not read the article to which it refers: [Here Filatov reads another question from listener] Has Sergey Aleksandrovich read the 22 to 24 April SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA? There is an article there entitled: I Beseech You To Think Again. The author is Metropolitan Ioann. Please could you comment on this piece? This question comes from Ivanov, a factory worker in Moscow. Unfortunately I have not read this piece. I told you, however, at the outset that the war is not about the relationship between the legislative and executive authorities, but about attitudes to reform. Different people, in all our country's structures, have different attitudes to reform.

[Konyukhov] Sergey Aleksandrovich, let me ask you a question myself now. I think it is rather unfortunate that both sides should be feuding on the eve of the referendum. All kinds of pinpricks have been exchanged. They are starting to hang out their dirty linen in public, if you do not mind my saying so. Things are getting worse. There was one piece which was published only yesterday which I just cannot ignore. I will ask you to explain and comment on it. On Thursday morning the press service of the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet issued all the chilling details, as IZVESTIYA puts it, of a coup d'etat which is planned for the night of 25 to 26 April. IZVESTIYA called this document a fabrication. What is your view of it, please?

[Filatov] The document is a fabrication. I received it as soon as it was released. I got in touch with the prosecutor general and the security minister immediately. This really is a fabrication, which worried all of us. I have repeatedly said that I am worried and alarmed most of all by various provocations which might happen on the eve of the referendum. Look at it this way: They are constantly trying to create what I would call a climate of fear, a state of fear in society, among all leaders of this society. In this climate of fear they hope to exploit any blunders or false moves that might be made.

Incidentally, if you analyze what has happened, you can see that they have been encouraging such an attitude toward the president ever since the Seventh Congress of People's Deputies or thereabouts. They are constantly trying to create a climate of fear at the Supreme Soviet, at the Congress of People's Deputies, to suggest that the president has something up his sleeve, that he wants to destroy these bodies. I think this tactic is now being extended, as it were, to the whole of society. This is terrible, of course. Somebody must be held responsible for this. Such things are unforgivable. Deputies should not be forgiven either when they come to the microphone and announce, for the entire country to hear, fictitious and fabricated things, allegations that...

[Konyukhov, interrupting] ...That tanks are being brought in.

[Filatov] Yes, that tanks are being brought in, that a state of emergency and presidential rule are imminent, and so on and so forth. I can state quite authoritatively that this is absolutely false, absolutely untrue. I hope that the people will react calmly to this, because such provocations are to be expected. Inflammatory statements of this kind may be encountered. One must react calmly to them. These are political provocations on the eve of the referendum.

What is at stake here? As far as questions one through three are concerned, forecasts of the results which we have received make us absolutely sure that there will not be a majority for the third question—no way. That is the question on whether the president should seek reelection before the end of his term. There will, on the other hand, be an absolute majority for question four. That is what the forecasts are saying. It is predicted that 68 percent of the voters on the electoral roll and 77 percent of the actual turn-out will vote yes to this question.

[Konyukhov] That is when the votes are counted?

[Filatov] When the votes are counted, yes. That is the prediction at the moment.

[Konyukhov] Precisely what the Constitutional Court ruling requires.

[Filatov] Of course, and the opposition realizes this. The majority on the first question may be in the region of 52 through 53 percent. Therefore, for a short time—precisely now, in fact—they have to create all the conditions, a climate of fear and suspicion, of artificial outrage, so that the president cannot garner enough votes on question one to win a vote of confidence. That is what is at stake.

Then, when the Congress of People's Deputies convenes, they will be able to say that the people have not expressed their views—because they could not. So, the Congress will decide all outstanding problems. That is what all this is leading up to. That is the political background to all this.

I happen to know, however, that today the president is scheduled to sign a directive instructing the Ministry of Security to investigate these matters. These people must not go unpunished. The Procuracy has been brought into this. I forwarded these documents to them yesterday. As you know, it was not just the Ministry of Security which issued a statement. The Supreme Soviet's Committee on Security also issued a statement yesterday, describing this claim as a fabrication—and that is very important.

[Konyukhov] Sergey Aleksandrovich, if you do not mind, I will summarize a number of questions because they all say roughly the same thing. This one, asked by Yevgeniy Viktorovich, a teacher from Moscow, is typical: Mr. Filatov, has the president not underestimated the threat of a communist-fascist coup?

[Filatov] It is right that this question should be asked, because against the backdrop, as it were...[pauses] well, let us see how it began, as it were, where the attacks came from. When the situation concerning economic reforms was at its most difficult, when we were going through this make or break point, as it were, of course, at that time all the opposition forces mobilized themselves, because they understood that it was only that brief period of time that could still furnish them with an opportunity to gain popular support. The people are wiser and more clever, however; they got to the bottom of these issues much better.

[Konyukhov] [passage omitted] Well, Olga Borisovna from Moscow—unfortunately her surname is illegible here—asks the following question: Are there more party apparatchiks in the presidential retinue or in the opposition? She lists the surnames of Poltoranin, Filippov, Burbulis, and, in the opposition, Chumakov, [words indistinct] and others. How are the party apparatchiks making their presence felt on both sides? Well, Olga Borisovna asks for answers to her questions. How will you reply?

[Filatov] Well, you see, I judge people by the position they adhere to now. There are party apparatchiks who, as it were, do not change their views, remaining true to their old views and convictions; these party apparatchiks are now in the opposition. The fact that none of us managed to avoid living under that system does not mean that we should have these people liquidated or (?make) the year of purges, the year 1937 (?happen again).

[Konyukhov] That is the stigma of our life.

[Filatov] Yes, it is the stigma of our life. There are people who have, well, put this communist poison behind, as it were. In view of many circumstances, the situation in the state, the development, as it were, of society in other countries, the current situation in the world at large, these people have, indeed, begun to view the future, the present, and their [word indistinct] past in a different light. I would not, in such a categorical manner, call everyone a partocrat, an apparatchik. Naturally, everyone worked as part of some system, but it is not this that defines these people and their views now.

[Konyukhov] As far as I understand, however, she is interested in which side has more apparatchiks?

[Filatov] Well, I have not done any calculations; I do not know which has more of them. I know that the president is surrounded by people who want to implement reforms very much and who care very much about building a new state.

[Konyukhov] Well, about reforms, Vladimir Vladimirovich asks the following question: Since when has the desire to change the social and state system in Russia begun to be read into the concept of reforms? No such trend in the president's activities could be discerned in his program during the elections.

[Filatov] Well, you know, there was talk about this back in the days of the USSR; the first debates were held on this at the first Congress of People's Deputies, and with the declaration of the Russian Federation, we started the transformations—political, state, and economic transformations. In reality, however, we embarked on economic reforms under Gaydar. Before that there was just talk, if you recall—debates, discussions, programs, concepts, and all that sort of thing...

[Konyukhov, interrupting] People scrutinized and scrutinized.

[Filatov] Yes, and in reality it was under Gaydar that we embarked on these reforms. Naturally, polarization began in society regarding what should be done. That is perfectly natural.

[Konyukhov] Here is a question, also about reforms, which for all its apparent simplistic nature, is nevertheless a very profound one. This is Izmaylov from Moscow who asks the question—he has just been on the phone with us—I would like to know what reforms we are talking about. They are not apparent, our listener claims, apart from the development of trade. Is this so, Sergey Aleksandrovich?

[Filatov] Well, I would not say they are not apparent; changes are taking place in many directions. Well, first of all, take where we have gotten to, and all the structures of power which were set up and the situation as it was when the CPSU was in power, when all the soviets were under the CPSU, when executive committees were under the soviets, and other situations. Today we see a quite different situation. We have three branches of power—legislative power, executive power headed by the president, and judicial power, a small branch, the Constitutional Court. This is quite a new structure of power in our state, which gives us the opportunity to switch toward a law-based state; in the coming months we will start to actively carry out reforms of judicial bodies.

[Konyukhov] But it seems to me our listener has in mind, first and foremost, the reforms and material prosperity connected with this. Surely one cannot but agree with this?

[Filatov] Yes...[pauses] no, the second direction is, naturally, economic reforms. Undoubtedly, economic reforms cannot be carried out in half a year, a year, or two years, bearing in mind that we are in a deep economic crisis. Of course, the shoots are already there, and many people have spoken about this. I believe that there is simply not enough time in today's program to say what is good and what is bad, but there are good sides to the reform and also bad sides. There have been miscalculations and errors, on the basis of which we are conducting analyses and, naturally, we are doing everything to ensure...

[Konyukhov, interrupting] And there is the question—you correctly said at the start of the program—about how one should treat these reforms. Should one support them, or...[pauses] people are saying no to these reforms.

[Filatov] Of course, in other words...

[Konyukhov, interrupting] And this, probably, should determine the position of an individual who is due to vote on Sunday at the referendum.

[Filatov] Of course, either we switch to a free economy or we go back to a distributive system. After all, what is the other side saying? They are talking about the reimposition of price and wage controls, are they not? Once again there will be those ceilings. They are all part and parcel of an ideal system of automatic regulation, but they will not be able to make that system work as ideally as they would like.

[Konyukhov] Sergey Aleksandrovich, there is one question which I cannot overlook, because it has been raised by many callers. Obviously it interests many people. It emerged a few days ago that Rutskoy was due to speak on TV today about his incriminating documents. What is your assessment of the vice president's behavior, above all, of course, his attitude toward the president? I am not interested in routine deviations. What I am interested in is his position concerning the president and his policies.

[Filatov] As you know, on the eve of the referendum the vice president began quite openly criticizing not just the government, but also the president himself. In one of his speeches he said there would be no reconciliation. So, he made it clear that he was engaged in a confrontation with the president over this issue. I have to say, however, that the confrontation has not been conducted openly. He is conducting it in the mass media, in speeches at the Supreme Soviet, without informing the president first. I regard this as a kind of political gambit, because he is linking the referendum—certain circles in the opposition are linking the referendum with a change at the top. This could be undertaken, if the referendum ends a certain way, because the Congress remains the supreme body of state power for the time being. Furthermore, they are hoping to provoke us into taking certain steps, through dirty leaflets of the kind I mentioned earlier, and other measures.

[Konyukhov] About a coup, you mean?

[Filatov] Yes, about a coup. So, I do not think Rutskoy's speech, the material which he spewed out, so to speak, at the Supreme Soviet, is any coincidence. However, I ought to point out immediately that the president has always paid very great attention to this question. If you remember, in October he appointed four officials to look into this. An interdepartmental commission of the Security Council was established on the basis of these four. By the way, I have also worked quite hard to arrive at an organization which could make an overall analysis of this question, based on the situation around the country. At Rutskoy's initiative, a closed meeting was held with law enforcement agencies, with all the organizations. The conference took place in Moscow on 12 February, if I remember correctly. At his request, it was a closed meeting. Not just these matters, but many others, were raised at this meeting. Ways of organizing an integrated, systematic drive against crime in the country were discussed there, on the grounds that it is escalating to completely new levels.

The reason he divulged all this material at the Supreme Soviet on the eve of the referendum is absolutely obvious. Many people—most people, I think—realize perfectly well what he is up to. This is a purely political gambit aimed not just at winning certain dividends for himself personally, although there is an element of that, as well. The primary objective, once again, is to discredit the president and his entourage, that notorious entourage which has to be depicted as criminal, and other charges. Since that speech I have collected piles of documents, official documents, which categorically disprove everything which he spewed out. I could read you a few of them now. I reject this totally because such things should not be spewed out. People cannot be labelled criminals until a court has done so. When unchecked facts, facts which are not even the subject of criminal charges, are spewed out from such a level, this shocks not just the entire country but the entire world. We have already received telegrams from other countries, asking what is going on? So...

[Konyukhov, interrupting] I think the situation will be clarified. After all, the president has issued instructions on some matters.

[Filatov] The president issued immediate instructions, of course, to the Ministry of Security, the Ministry of Internal Affairs, and to the auditing department.

[Konyukhov] But, unfortunately, the situation will only be cleared up after the referendum.

[Filatov] Yes.

[Konyukhov] And all this happened before the referendum. Sergey Aleksandrovich, this...

[Filatov, interrupting] I believe that Sergey Shakhray will speak today or tomorrow. He is chairman of the government commission which took a preliminary look at all this evidence, so to speak. I believe he is going to speak out and clear up a lot of issues with which the public is concerned regarding this question. What shocks me most of all, of course, is the way a state official can speak publicly about unchecked facts and documents, thereby inflicting harm, economic harm, upon our state. Nakhodka, for example, is taking the matter to court. They have a case. After all, we are not living in a totalitarian society now. We are living in a society which already has a market of sorts. Exchanges have already been established.

[Konyukhov] This is part of democracy.

[Filatov] Of course. Exchanges and shares have already come into existence. Some elements of the market already exist. Nakhodka's shares have lost half their value. What are they to do now? They could even go bankrupt. They have very many foreign shareholders there. How could he do this? How could he inflict such a damaging, even fatal blow on organizations which are now feeding the country?

[Konyukhov] Sergey Aleksandrovich, here is the last question about Rutskoy's position, about the motives for his latest behavior, in particular, and his overall stance, in general. You have often said that he is playing politics. Is he playing politics on behalf of certain circles or does it have more to do with his own personal ambition to become president, if you do not mind my putting it that way?

[Filatov] I think so, because his latest speeches, particularly the one at the Congress of People's Deputies, point to this in the way the material is set forth. In one of these speeches he even forgot to mention that he served not only the law, the Supreme Soviet, the Congress of People's Deputies and all that, but also the president. He just failed to mention it, so he already sees himself as president. I believe that is the reason. That is how far political ambitions can take you.

Then, multiple authority should not be allowed to exist in the country. The country should have one top state official. It should have a legislative body to determine, as it were, the rules for this top official. What do we have in the country now? We have several political leaders. Khasbulatov is a politician, so to speak, but according to the Constitution, he is a functionary—a top-ranking functionary of a legislative body, responsible for organizing the work of this body.

[Konyukhov] Chairman of the assembly.

[Filatov] Chairman, but not merely of an assembly. Look what Article 15 of the Constitution says. After all, one should from time to time turn to the Constitution, look at what it says, and proceed from there. [Filatov reads aloud from the Constitution] The chairman of the Supreme Soviet carries out general guidance—the next few words tend to be overlooked by some—for the preparation of issues subject to examination by the Congress. Not guidance over the Congress, not leadership of the legislative body, but preparation of issues. He is a top functionary, as it were.

So we have another political leader. This means that when the two do not agree, they wage war. Then a third political leader emerges—the vice president, who is supposed to work on the president's instructions. Another top official, a third one. So war begins in society. If they cannot reach agreement between themselves, it splashes over onto the street—this is a law in politics.

[Konyukhov] Yes indeed. May I venture to point out that Russia is not at all used to such a variety and multitude of leaders, if you forgive me for saying so. From time immemorial, Russia has followed one leader. The fact that under current conditions, in a democratic society, this leader ought to be checked, ought to be responsible to the people, is quite another matter, but it should probably still be one leader.

[Filatov] Yes, the law is the law; it is the Constitution, which defines rules of behavior, rules of administration, and rules of the game, as it were.

[Konyukhov] I believe the referendum will exactly demonstrate whether we are correct in our thinking and whether the people are prepared to follow one leader. Now, questions from our listeners—we have still have a few minutes left.

[Filatov] Here is a question...

[Konyukhov, interrupting] Natalya Alekseyevna, is it not...

[Filatov, interrupting] What results has the social-economic policy pursued by the president achieved in 1992? First, I would like to say that for a good many years we were at a standstill. That was extremely painful and ended up by bringing the country virtually to the brink of a catastrophe in 1991, when there were no more goods, prices were not controlled, and there was no more hard currency because it all had to be paid out towards the Soviet Unions's debts—there was nothing. So, now we have made a step toward the market, and that is the first thing. I believe this to be a great success, as it were. During the first few months, we overcame the fear looming over everybody: When prices were to shoot up for the first time, how would the people have handled this shock, especially given the state they already were in? They did cope with it. Goods have started to appear, and enterprises started getting used to the new ways and establishing links among themselves. At the most recent industrialists' congress, attempts were made to impose limitations on the directors' corps. A stong rebuff was given to this across the board. The supplies and distribution system is now at its formative stage, at the stage of shaping itself. The most important thing is that we, the government, have the opportunity today to move forward, intensifying reform in a conscious, sustained manner, rather than chaotically plugging emerging holes. We have the opportunity to reinforce and support these structures, to either restructure those enterprises which may become bankrupt, or, if they are ineffective and totally technologically backward, then lose them. Such enterprises total 11 percent of all enterprises, according to forecasts. That is, the first year of reform has given us a lot, although, as I have already said, there were major mistakes, especially in releasing credits, in the financial and credits policy, in the tax policy. Our tax policy is still unreasonable. Yesterday, by the way, I got a report which claims that we can pull ourselves out of inflation by abolishing three taxes, and by committing enterprises to put a share of their profits into working capital.

[Konyukhov] To make up for these taxes, that is.

[Filatov] There are such proposals. Now we must study everything calmly, intensifying reform step by step. There are first positive steps already.

[Konyukhov] Sergey Aleksandrovich, we must be honest and say, I believe, that things will not get better right after the referendum, as if someone has waved a magic wand. Am I right? Maybe some things will become even harder, but this is the way to a real improvement, to a life which we have not yet seen, or have only seen on TV in Westerns. Am I right?

[Filatov] Yes, you are right. The most important action we should take after the referendum is to press on and adopt the new constitution, because, you see, it would settle quite a lot of problems for us. Because the first thing we ought to decide - we ought to lose this useless and dangerous body, the Congress of People's Deputies. We ought to adopt a two-chamber system, right? But for this, we need a new constitution, or, say, a law on parliament. We ought to prepare for new elections, and it seems that elections should be organized along party lines. All this is new for us, but we must go for it. This, I believe, ought to be the main result of this referendum.

Naturally, the process of economic reform does not stop. It will develop further. The government, as it were, has a blueprint for this, a program, a plan of action. All this is well known; deputies also have copies of all these things. They have been distributed many times, but the most important thing for us today is to stabilize the political system. The opposition should calm down, and it can only calm down when the president receives sufficient and conclusive majority support from the people. He ought to be helped in this today, because the raging opposition outbursts today are, of course, stirring up society to a very large degree. We know that the atmosphere in the regions today is more or less quiet, with the response to the opposition second to none—we have reports from the regions saying that it amounts to some 100 to 150 people. So the thing is not to explode the calm in the country. Moscow and St. Petersburg, two or three towns, is enough, but elsewhere calm should be preserved, as it were. Society needs it for the success of reform, to get as much as possible from it.

[Konyukhov] Sergey Aleksandrovich, you have just said that the opposition is stirring up public opinion today, but what about tomorrow? Just imagine: If the referendum turns out to be against Yeltsin, what do you think would happen next?

[Filatov] I believe everything will be...[pauses] it is not without reason that the deputies have been told to gather here on 26 April. That is when the Congress of People's Deputies may meet.

[Konyukhov] Do you really think so?

[Filatov] This is what I am forecasting. The argument there may run as follows: The people have not reached a decision. The people have not made up their mind. The people may even have...[pauses] these negative results may even have to be regarded as evidence that the people are not offering their support, that they do not have confidence, and so on. So, the argument continues: let us stage a trial here at the Congress of People's Deputies, and put everything in its place. That could happen.

[Konyukhov] I think we should not only raise the responsibility of our listeners, but also set them thinking. Therefore, could you please answer this question: We cannot understand what the difference is between programs of reform put forward by the parliament and those put forward by the president. We must know what we are voting for, asks Natalya Aleksandrovna.

[Filatov] As for the parliament's programs of reform, I do not know them myself, because they do not exist; they have not been published. There were certain speeches, mainly criticizing Gaydar's program, the only program which did appear officially. Some people also have said: Yes, indeed, we have programs; we have the way out of this situation. One can gather from individual phrases and articles, written also by the leadership of the Supreme Soviet, that the economy and the market should be regulated, that prices should be controlled, as it were, that wages should be capped, and other measures. All of us who had to bear with the former command and distribution market—if I may call it this—we all understand that these are all elements of that deja vu command and distribution system.

[Konyukhov] So, this means a return to the past, in principle, one way or the other.

[Filatov] That is what I believe as well.

[Konyukhov] Here is yet another question, by our listener Petrova: Does Sergey Aleksandrovich believe it to be democratic when the mass media is constantly biased in favor of the president. I do not want to forestall your answer, but...

[Filatov, interrupting] You know, Andrey Mikhaylovich, before starting this discussion I spoke to some people here in the corridor. They told me: We used to have one radio, mono-radio, as it were. Now we have 32 radio stations, all of them independent. That is what really struck me: Should we follow to the letter the Supreme Soviet's decisions and set up 32 supervisory councils? There will be 320 stations tomorrow; should we then have 320 supervisory councils? That is a nightmare. We have 32 stations, which we call independent exactly because they can express their views. Today they support the president, but we know there was a time when these structures, these stations were speaking out against the Soviet Union's president. Therefore, I believe these things ought to be regulated by legislation. As long as they do not break the law, let them go ahead and broadcast whatever they deem necessary.

[Konyukhov] I have just received a very interesting message from our girls. It says they have received over 15 calls expressing gratitude for the program about the president and his family. This presumably refers to the TV program that Eldar Ryazanov made. Kindest regards to Boris Nikolayevich and Naina Iosifovna [Mrs. Yeltsin].

[Filatov] Thank you.

[Konyukhov] Well, I think you will pass on this message...

[Filatov, interrupting] They are probably listening themselves.

[Konyukhov] Still, I would like to hand it to you, so that you pass it on to the secretariat at least, to Boris Nikolayevich. Hopefully, he will be glad to see it on the eve of this crucial test.

Here is another question. It may be a slight digression, but I would like you to say a few words. It seems to me that the democrats are not quite right in their attitude to Lenin, to his New Economic Policy—NEP—is that so? This question is signed Iosif Abramovich Basov, pensioner, Moscow.

[Filatov] Well, when an economic reform program for our country was being considered, I think that the NEP period, the NEP program, were taken into account. It seems to me, however, that it is difficult now to go back to all those programs originally studied. We have entered the market the way we did, and the great hope now is that the government, through studying and determining priority targets, the most effective, and also the most vulnerable, the least effective options, would start transformations, including ones on the structural level, in order to have something to invest in to produce goods. Because until we get more goods...

[Konyukhov, interrupting] Until we start producing, that is it. Not exchanging things as in subsistence farming...

[Filatov, interrupting] Yes, until then we cannot do anything. On the other hand, we need not really be too afraid, because although inflation is by no means a good thing, it is no doubt very bad, a tragedy for the state. Yet many countries in the world have passed through this phase. I visited Turkey, were 500,000 [lira] is small change. It shows that they have gone through that period; it lasted for several years there, as well. We have recently been to Mexico; there the period of economic reform and overcoming the crisis lasted eight years. Today, they have already obtained positive results; quite good results actually. I must say that we too have already achieved some results. Take pensions, for instance. People in this program have been asking about pensions. We have started calculating today. Say, before this period, pensions expressed in dollars used to amount to about $2. Today it is about 4,500 rubles, so even if we take a 1000:1 exchange rate, it stands at $5.

[Konyukhov] About $5, yes.

[Filatov] About $5. So there is some growth here. Second, the pensions ratio used to be 120 to 70, if you remember, 120—maximum and 70—minimum pension. Today, as we know, the minimum is 4.500 rubles, but what about the maximum? I do not know; there are such figures as 8,000; 14,000; even 30,000 rubles. The relative margin is wider today than it used to be—we can see a certain amount of progress here.

[Konyukhov] Yes, progress is the most important; we should get away from the stability of poverty. It must not keep people in the state of humiliation, especially pensioners.

[Filatov] I attended a meeting in my community a few days ago, and you know, what surprised me was that pensioners came up to me and said: You know, Sergey Aleksandrovich, stop raising our pensions, because you raise our pensions, but we understand that they can buy us less and less. The reason is inflation. People understand this, but it was a forced measure. It was the Supreme Soviet's decision. That is how the principle of indexation was first started. Certainly, it did boost inflation, but what I am saying is that people's awareness and understanding of many issues are growing.

[Konyukhov] [passage omitted] One last question, Sergey Aleksandrovich. How are you going to vote, and what would you say to our listeners before you go?

[Filatov] I will vote: yes, yes, no, yes—that is my firm decision. I am grateful for a chance to be on your program. I feel much friendliness from listeners who have sent their numerous messages, which I will examine later very attentively. I would like to wish everybody who is with us right now to treat all the recent and upcoming events in a calm and composed manner. Please do not succumb to any kind of provocations. Today, for instance, I was told over the phone, that we, or rather different bodies including the electoral commissions, the Supreme Soviet, and the Defense Ministry, have decided that servicemen of our units and garrisons must vote at polling stations with everybody else, right? So, we are now inundated with phone calls. Some people want to interpret this as bringing troops into town and claim that this would allegedly be done to introduce some kind of state of emergency. So, what I want to say is this: Take it all calmly. The president has very firm, serious, and normal intentions to turn our state into a democratic state ruled by law. He does not intend to use stong-arm tactics. Of this I can assure you, but one ought to realize one other thing, as well: The Congress and the Supreme Soviet have left the president very little room to maneuver, in legal terms, for resolving these issues. Therefore, he is compelled to turn to the people; this may not be the last time. He may well do it again, for he has no other way of resolving these issues. So, I plea for your support for the president, and your backing for the course pursued by him and by the executive, by our government. Thank you for your attention.

[Konuyukhov] Thank you once again on behalf of all our listeners.

Supreme Soviet

Khasbulatov Interview on Referendum

LD2304151993 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1140 GMT 23 Apr 93

[Interview with Supreme Soviet Chairman Ruslan Khasbulatov by unidentified reporter on 23 April; place not given—recorded; from the "Radio Parliament" feature]

[Text] [Reporter] This is "Radio Parliament." Ruslan Imranovich, we are facing a somewhat difficult task because for a long time society has been inundated with a certain kind of information, and many people are getting furious whenever they hear the words parliament or deputies. They have been made to think in a certain way. This fact has to be taken into account. I am keeping in touch with listeners and will not hide the fact that after all the films that have been shown, the radio programs that have been broadcast, and the articles that have been published about you, people are wary of you, too.

Nevertheless, I believe that he who hath ears to hear, let him hear and compare. You and I will have this conversation for those who can hear and accept a different opinion. What is your view of the situation in the country on the eve of the referendum?

[Khasbulatov] First, I agree with you, of course, on the point that society is split and that, indeed, my name or the word deputy makes some people furious, while others become furious when they hear the president's name. Unfortunately the things that I have been mentioning for the last six months have come true; that is, that the struggle by way of referendum, the struggle for some kind of victory, will deepen the split.

I have mentioned this point dozens of times to the esteemed president, and he postponed his decision to put certain issues to a referendum several times, but then, under pressure from some forces, he would revert to that idea. So something predicted by far-sighted people has eventually taken place: Society has split.

Frankly speaking, people are naturally very tired of this propaganda. Antiparliamentary and antipresidential feelings are very strong. Society has split altogether; this is where we are.

In my view, objectively speaking, there can be neither winners nor losers here. Only the state will be the loser. It is a question of further weakening the state, something I also warned the president about. We can see ourselves that the role of federal authority is rapidly dwindling. So it is simply absurd to blow the victory trumpet and all that. It is a tragic farce, in my view.

Taking advantage of this opportunity, I would like to call upon our compatriots to calm down a little. I would like to point their attention to the fact that life does not end with the referendum. Naturally, we have to build our state, implement our reforms, and improve in every possible way the situation of people who have been hounded down and made unhappy and miserable. This has been done, naturally, under our president's leadership and with the parliament's participation. So we are equally guilty of these misfortunes and sufferings. I must say, though, that if they had observed our laws correctly and if we had been implementing the reforms in harmony, more or less, these tragedies would surely not have taken place.

[Reporter] Ruslan Imranovich, of course I regard attempts at self-justification concerning all the issues and facts ascribed to the deputies, the parliament, and you alike as a thankless task. Nevertheless....

[Khasbulatov, interrupting] I do beg your pardon. We have no intention of trying to justify ourselves. Let those people who were named by the vice president try to justify themselves with specific regard to some criminal actions, even large-scale ones. Yesterday you must have heard about it—I did too—that one of the president's closest ideologists and advisers, Burbulis, is already having a criminal case brought against him, so it is not the members of the parliament who need to justify themselves. It seems to me that it is precisely this that they fear and that is why they have unleashed this noisy and mendacious campaign, precisely because of fear, to be sure.

[Reporter] Nevertheless, Ruslan Imranovich, the views that are gaining ground in society are very diverse. I beg your pardon, but one such view is that Khasbulatov is hankering after power. This is what I wanted to ask you. Let us have a more detailed chat or response, a detailed response .

[Khasbulatov] Why should I hanker after power if I am in power? I am chairman of the Supreme Soviet. After all, I chair the sittings of the Congress of People's Deputies, I chair the sittings of the Supreme Soviet, I am the chairman of the Supreme Soviet. What power? It is ridiculous.

[Reporter] Maybe you know something else we don't?

[Khasbulatov] I do not know anything else absolutely, but I would like these problems to be put behind us once and for all. Since people are being asked to make a choice between one man and another....[pauses] It is ridiculous, because I have no connection with the referendum at all. The president insisted that people say whether or not they support his personal course, his own course. Is that not so? That is why people must know whether they support the president. I am neither here nor there; Khasbulatov is tne chairman of the Supreme Soviet.

Incidentally, since the question is being posed in this way and the entire society really believes that I am hankering after any sort of power, and even that personal factors are becoming involved, for God's sake, I suggest right now—I can even speak on TV and will even prepare something written—I suggest this: OK, Boris Nikolayevich, let us both resign. Let others tackle things. If we are considered guilty of this breakdown—as I said, one part of society regards the president as guilty, another part of society regards Khasbulatov as guilty—let us rid this country of ours of our joint presence. Is that proof of whether or not I want power? I am ready to do this, together with Boris Nikolayevich, Esteemed Boris Nikolayevich.

[Reporter] Ruslan Imranovich, it probably ought to be stressed at this point that if Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin were in fact to leave his post, that very same post that you are allegedly bent on winning, the vice president is supposed to take his place.

[Khasbulatov] You are absolutely right. Under the Constitution, the president's place has to be taken by the vice president if he retires for whatever reason, if he cannot perform his duties. If the vice president cannot take the post, the president's place is taken by the head of the federal government. That is what our Constitution says.

You are talking about the Turkish Constitution. President Ozal has just died there. He was a very talented man, by the way. He did a very great deal to modernize and reform Turkey. That is why Turkey is developing so swiftly. It did not go down the road which is being foisted on us. So, in accordance with the Turkish Constitution, Speaker of Parliament Cindoruk is acting president there for the time being, until new elections are held.

But we are living by the Russian Constitution, not the Turkish Constitution. Under the Russian Constitution, if the president is unable for whatever reason to perform his duties, if he is dismissed or if he retires, his place is taken by the vice president. That is what the Constitution says. If the vice president is unable to step in, the president's place is taken by the head of the government. That is what our Constitution says.

I don't see what this has to do with me. I don't understand why they are constantly trying to drag my name into these games. I did not start them. I was against this referendum anyway. I said the following to Boris Nikolayevich: Let's stand for reelection. Let's do that. After all, when we came to power Russia was still a Union Republic. We were not an independent state. But now we are a completely independent country. Our fellow citizens did not elect us as people's deputies of an independent state. That's the first thing.

Second, Boris Nikolayevich, you were not elected as the leader of an independent state but as the leader of a Union Republic. For this reason citizens doubt whether we are entitled to do the very important work we are now doing, running domestic policy and foreign policy. By the way, foreign policy has, sad to say, become very seriously dependent on external factors. That's no secret. Exactly the same applies to domestic policy, domestic economic policy. So that's why I proposed that we should seek reelection.

But it has now become clear that this referendum is not likely to produce a result which allows the president to pursue unconstitutional reforms. It is clear that he will not get an absolute majority. Naturally, being supported only by a minority, the president has no right to implement any constitutional changes.

[Reporter] Here is another question from listeners that I cannot withhold: The people are worried about the consequences of the vice president's speech in which he mentioned the names of some top figures in our government, accusing them of abusing power and violating the law. The listeners are worried that these people will try to do everything to avoid criminal investigations and to this end may manipulate the results of the referendum to escape justice.

[Khasbulatov] Of course they will try to do everything. We already know about a large number of cases which involve falsifications, juggling with figures, bribes. We hear about such things everyday and newspapers keep on reporting about this. Of course they will try. A campaign is already under way to gather some compromising information about the vice president.

As for myself, you should know already that from time to time I am being accused of mixing with Chechen mafia, this, that or another. This is while all my life....[pauses] I have been living in Moscow since I was 20. By the way, I came here not from Groznyy but from Almaty. I finished night school there, in northern Kazakhstan, where my mother and I were exiled. She worked as a dairy maid.

Naturally, if the mother is a peasant, a dairy maid, the children too are peasants. So we lived for 10 years there, in northern Kazakhstan. After that we moved to Moscow. I studied at night school from the eighth grade. I worked as a construction worker, an unskilled laborer. After that I began my studies here in Moscow University. I have been living here for more than 30 years, and I got my candidate of economic science degree. At the age of 37 I became a doctor of economic science. How could I have time for the mafia if I had to work in the academy, in higher education, chaired a department, supervised dozens of candidates and doctors of science, and taught hundreds of young economists? I am proud of this and I would actually be happy to return to my old institute and chair my old department.

Still, they are nosing around me, gathering intelligence, watching who comes to visit me, who my friends are, what their nationalities are. We did not have this sort of thing even in the communist times!

You know, when I studied at Moscow University, we had 20,000 Komsomol members there, and I was elected secretary of the Komsomol committee. Our life was not based on nationalist factors. So how come today's democrats—the people calling themselves democrats—are degrading themselves to such an extent as to embrace elements of fascism? How does it happen? I feel deeply indignant about this.

Now we have certain slogans voiced in the democratic press and on television. What they boil down to is that the Chechens should go back to Groznyy, the Tatars to Kazan, the Jews to Israel, the Armenians to Yerevan, and so on. Look what dishonest propaganda is being carried out! It corrupts people.

[Reporter] Ruslan Imranovich, excuse me please. Unfortunately our meeting was a little too late and the team has to rush off to the studio. I hope that if the "Radio Parliament" continues its broadcasts in the future, you will be coming to our studio to answer all the listeners' questions. Now, on the eve of the referendum....

[Khasbulatov, interrupting] Yes, but let me say something, just one thing. Esteemed listeners, you must realize the following. The Constitutional Court ruled that the first question—do you have confidence in the president?—was an unconstitutional question. Therefore, irrespective of how many votes the president gets on this question, the President is not entitled to adopt decisions which stray outside the Constitution. Therefore, if the president does try to go outside the Constitution, we—the Supreme Soviet or the congress, and the Constitutional Court—will be obliged to declare these decisions illegal.

[Reporter] On the basis of the referendum results, you mean?

[Khasbulatov] Yes, the president is not entitled, on the basis of the referendum results, to adopt decisions which go outside the framework of the Constitution.

[Reporter] On the first two questions?

[Khasbulatov] On the first, the second, and the third. These are not questions for the president. The court ruled that they are unconstitutional. What I have in mind here is this: You have seen that Sergey Mikhaylovich Shakhray has made public a plan to implement presidential transformations, where everything is scheduled. He will dissolve the congress, dissolve the Supreme Soviet, dissolve representative bodies in the republics, oblasts, and krays, introduce presidential rule, and so on and so forth. So all this will be considered illegal and anticonstitutional. All our fellow citizens should bear this in mind.

[Reporter] Thank you for the meeting.

[Khasbulatov] Thank you.

Says Referendum Results To 'Split' Country

LD2604092193 Moscow Mayak Radio Network in Russian 0800 GMT 26 Apr 93

[Report by special correspondent Aleksandr Ruvinskiy on statement by Supreme Soviet Chairman Ruslan Khasbulatov at a session of the Supreme Soviet Presidium in Moscow on 26 April]

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] I would now like to draw our listeners' attention to a statement made at the session of the [Supreme Soviet] Presidium by Supreme Soviet Chairman Ruslan Khasbulatov. He noted that the results of the vote on the third and fourth questions will be calculated not on the basis of those who actually voted, but on those who are entitled to vote. For Russia the difference could be several million votes. In addition, he said that according to the estimate of the Supreme Soviet, 63 percent of the voters could have taken part in the referendum. Well, preliminary figures indicate that 62 percent took part.

Ruslan Khasbulatov went on to say:

[Begin Khasbulatov recording] And now a few remarks on the referendum. First, I would urge everyone, on both sides, not to be seduced by the results. As we said six months ago, the referendum will not produce winners or losers. All it will do is, quite clearly, split our society. A person I respect visited me the day before yesterday. With sorrow, he took out his address book and said: Like everyone else, I have names in my address book—and of course not the names of my enemies. But now, I can divide them half and half.

Well, of course in time all this will be restored and so on; but at present this referendum has brought about a split in our society.

First, you can rejoice as much as you like, if that is what you were trying to achieve. You have attained your goal. The second task: the referendum is a stage on the way to weakening the state. Those who wanted to rejoice can do so, because that too has been achieved. This confirms once again that, apart from the defeat of the state, this referendum gives us absolutely no decisions, whatever the starting point. And the starting point is that which we spoke of before the referendum. That is all. You can rejoice as much as you like: that this or that person has stood firm, or has not stood firm; that this is support, or that this is not support. Third, what has of course emerged is the exclusively negative role of the electronic mass media. Society can no longer tolerate the terrorism of the news media.

So I have this to say to you, esteemed colleagues who are sitting here, members of the Presidium, deputies, chairmen of the chambers, committees, and commissions: Be good enough to prepare, very soon, the necessary documents for submission to the Supreme Soviet.

Let me deal very briefly with these issues. Well, as for how it is going, in general it is what we expected. I will tell you a secret: in another three days we would have mastered the situation completely. The counterpropaganda machine that we had indeed very effectively put into action in order to neutralize Poltoranin's Goebbels-style lies was working at full strength literally on the last day. If we had had another three days or so, you would have seen quite a different result. [end recording] Lisin, the chairman of the media committee, submitted a motion to reorganize that committee. A decision on this will be made at a Supreme Soviet session this week.

Yeltsin Secretary Rejects Remarks

LD2604135893 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1322 GMT 26 Apr 93

[Text] Moscow, 26 Apr (ITAR-TASS)—The statement by the speaker of the Supreme Soviet that "the referendum has split our society" is further evidence of Ruslan Khasbulatov's lack of respect for the will of the people and for the patriotism of Russia's population, states the press secretary of the president of the Russian Federation.

The massive support that the people of Russia have given to the president and his policy is proof of the emergence and strengthening in Russia of a general will of the people for rebirth through democratic reform.

The referendum has demonstrated the consolidation of broad sections of the population around the president's policy and the ideals of building a great Russia, which Boris Yeltsin is offering in the interests of all Russia's people regardless of their political beliefs.

The opinion of Ruslan Khasbulatov, which he voiced at a Supreme Soviet Presidium session, and his attempts to denigrate the outcome of the referendum before its final results are known, show that the conservative leadership of the Supreme Soviet is increasingly losing touch with reality.

The danger is that the leadership of the Supreme Soviet may lose the ground beneath its feet and incite the deputies to rash and aggressive actions, which could damage Russia's democracy, including the rights of the people of Russia to freedom of information and freedom of speech, the press secretary's statement says.

Khasbulatov Views Possible Referendum Outcomes

LD2304163493 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1622 GMT 23 Apr 93

[Text] Moscow April 23 TASS—In the opinion of Russian Parliament Speaker Ruslan Khasbulatov, there are several possibilities of referendum outcome.

If President Boris Yeltsin is approved by the absolute majority of Russians, he may raise the question of his enhanced powers. "Such claims will be grounded and it will be difficult for the Supreme Soviet to abstain from supporting the president's intentions, but, certainly, this should be done in a constitutional way," stressed Khasbulatov at today's meeting of Parliament heads and intellectuals at the Russian House of Soviets.

If Yeltsin is supported by a relative majority, it will be an impasse, said the parliament speaker. If the president does not gain the majority of votes, he "will have to resign, as he had promised. But this is a hypothetic case," noted Khasbulatov. The Parliament will form a new "majority government", capable of carrying out reforms, and "not standing on their way".

Khasbulatov described as the main reform obstacle representatives of the executive power, "involved in intrigues and rows", and added "the process of global destruction is underway".

"It is painful for me to watch some intellectuals helping to revive the personality cult, this time in a tragicomic form," said the speaker. All meetings are "now viewed through the prism of the upcoming referendum, but life will go on after April 25. We do not want that day to bring surprises that will remain in history."

Regional Affairs

Yeltsin Attends Housing Opening for Afghan Veterans

LD2404120993 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1010 GMT 24 Apr 93

[By ITAR-TASS Correspondent Gennadiy Talalayev]

[Text] Moscow, 24 Apr—Russian President Boris Yeltsin said today that in the upcoming referendum Russia's citizens will "choose their destiny." "It is in your hands and your destiny will be the kind that you vote for," he said, speaking at a short rally in a housing development in Orekhovo-Borisov in Moscow on the occasion of the commissioning of a housing block built for veterans of the Afghan war.

The president admitted that the solution to the housing problem for veterans of the Afghan war throughout Russia is complicated. Muscovites are the first, he noted, as in many other things, to show some initiative and find a solution to this problem with the help of the country's leadership. The housing is being offered free to war veterans.

"Having looked around the house," Boris Yeltsin continued, "as a former construction worker I tried to see if there were any faults but I could not find any. The layout is good, the kitchens are small yet comfortable, and the plumbing and elevators are working."

In the president's words, more than 1,000 former 'afgantsy' in Moscow are still without accomodation. In connection with this he asked Moscow Mayor Yuriy Luzhkov to find solution to their housing problem within a year, bearing in mind that the Moscow construction workers are among the very few in Russia who managed to maintain the volume of housing construction on the level of 3 million square meters a year. The president has also apealed to the leaders of the republics of the Russian Federation and the heads of regional administrations to follow the Moscow example. "We are indebted to the 'afgantsy,'" he said.

Having congratulated the new settlers, Boris Yeltsin said: "I hope that you will live in accord and love, peacefully. Life and the economy in Russia will gradually improve. We believe that stabilization will come during the current year."

Galina Bogonos spoke at the meeting on behalf of the mothers of the 'afgantsy' soldiers who died in the war. Like eight other families of dead servicemen, she was given an apartment in this building. Galina Bogonos stated that all the new settlers will give their votes tomorrow to Boris Yeltsin. "We do not want a return to the past," she stressed.

Chechen President 'Fully in Control;' Rallies Continue

LD2504115893 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1137 GMT 25 Apr 93

[By ITAR-TASS special correspondent Aleksandr Kharchenko]

[Text] Groznyy April 25 TASS—"President Dzokhar Dudayev is fully in control of the situation in the Chechen Republic", stated Muvladiy Udogov, chairman of the National Information Service.

In an ITAR-TASS interview, Udogov said the functioning of the republican Security Ministry had been suspended by Dudayev's decision. The ministry has been temporarily put under the authority of Salman Khasimikov, commandant of the Chechen Republic and chairman of the National Security Service. All armed organisations operating in the republic are also subordinated to him for the curfew validity period.

Two rallies are still going on here on Sunday. Enrollment in a volunteer corps is in progress in Freedom Square where Dudayev's supporters gather.

The two opposing sides were indignant at Saturday's provocation when a grenade was hurled into the Security Ministry building, wounding three staff members of the ministry.

Chechen President Calls For Stabilization

LD2504172293 Moscow ITAR-TASS in English 1704 GMT 25 Apr 93

[Text] Groznyy April 25—Chechen President Dzhokhar Dudayev asked members of the Chechen Parliament not to fall for provocations, to rally all sound forces for the stabilization and strengthening of the state. He believes that the decision to hold early elections to parliament in September and to hold simultaneously a referendum on the constitution would help normalize the situation in Chechnya.

A tense situation that existed in the recent days regarding the Security Ministry has normalised, CHECHEN-PRESS writes. This happened after Dzhokhar Dudayev, who is supreme commander of the Chechen Republic's

Armed Forces, subordinated the entre apparatus of the Security Ministry and district departments of security to the commandant of the republic, Chairman of the National Security Service Salman Khasimikov. All units of law-enforcement bodies are under his command.

Rallies of Dudayev's supporters and opponents continue in Groznyy, but their tone became more moderate.

Dudayev Supporters Take Over Airport, Other Sites

LD2504213693 Moscow Mayak Radio Network in Russian 2000 GMT 25 Apr 93

[Text] National guards units loyal to the president of Chechnya have taken the airport, communications system, and the transport junctions of the republic under control. Dzhokhar Dudayev called on his fellow-countrymen not to yield to provocations. The rallies in Groznyy continued yesterday, although without the previous heat.

Chechen Power Crisis Analyzed

MK2404104293 Moscow NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA in Russian 24 Apr 93 p 3

[Timur Muzayev report: "Crisis After the Revolution. Political Division So Far Limited to Opposing Rallies"]

[Text] Political tensions have been high in the Chechen Republic for over a week. President Dudayev's loyalists, who gathered on Freedom Square, demand that his edicts of 17 April dissolving the parliament, introducing presidential rule, imposing a curfew, and appointing a vice president and prosecutor general be observed and also insist that all authority should be handed over to Dudayev. The opposition, on Theater Square, demands the resignation of all the branches of power and new democratic elections to the Chechen parliament. Both groups have armed supporters and command mass support from Chechnya's rural population, so the participants of both rallies are in a fairly decisive mood.

General Dudayev and his followers claim that the current conflict was caused by the intrigues of partocrats who dream of coming back to power, and by provocations on the part of the Russian Supreme Soviet deputies from the former Checheno-Ingushetia, who, in the president's view, would like to unleash civil war in the republic. The opposition, however, believes that the roots of the conflict are elsewhere: in the steep slump in living standards of the majority of the population and the government's inability to cope with a catastrophic economic collapse.

The president's opponents cite the fact that in conditions of unbridled inflation and skyrocketing prices of staple goods, salaries of enterprise workers and civil servants have been virtually frozen. Doctors, school teachers, industrial workers, professors, and those working in the area of science and culture are paid three to four times less than their Russian counterparts. At the same time, payments are delayed for six or more months (the government cites as a reason for this the shortage of cash caused by a financial blockade on the part of the Russian Federation, but this blockade does not prevent various banks from granting multimillion ruble loans to businessmen close to the government). How can those who did not have time or were unable to hoard large stocks of goods in advance survive in such conditions?

The opposition notes that President Dudayev has demonstrated not only his inability to manage the republic's economy in a normal fashion, but also an absolute indifference to the problems and needs of the ordinary people.

What is the reason for this inability? To understand it, one has to get back to the events of the so-called Chechen revolution of September-November 1991, when the incumbent regime came into being. According to most political scientists, at a time when under pressure from a mass popular movement the old authorities were disbanded and a new leadership under General Dudayev faced the problem of forming state authorities in the Chechen Republic, the solution of this problem was handed over to the key figures of the shadow economy. They emerged as some of the most influential members of the new regime. According to this theory, the mafia-political groupings that emerged in the autumn of 1991 have formed the current state arrangement guided by their own interests and purposes which boiled down to extracting maximum profits from the republic's economy and natural resources. Thus, the Dudayev government proved incapable of action simply because it was not set up to manage the economy in an effective and efficient way, but to serve totally different purposes, the opposition claims. According to the Chechen National Security Service, at present there are three mafia-political groups specializing in oil, arms, and privatization, with the most influential one operating in the oil products sector.

The opposition points to the fact that the authorities that were created by the national revolution and called themselves "national," have effectively destroyed national culture, science, and education. If in the past these sectors were financed from the leftovers of the budget appropriations, now they do not receive any financing at all. This situation prompted an exodus of the intelligentsia from the republic; tellingly, it is not only Russian-speaking residents, but also Chechens disgruntled with the policies pursued by the national government who are leaving en masse.

So far the Dudayev government has been more or less successful in averting the explosion of mass indignation by using as its trump card the threat of outside aggression from Russia. At a moment when political uncertainties and growing disenchantment of the masses posed a real threat to the existence of the regime, calls for consolidation and the armed defense of independence ensued, coupled with accusations of a lack of patriotism and pursuit of a pro- imperialist course heaped on political opponents. It should be admitted that Russian policies in the Caucasus have played right into the hands of Dudayev loyalists. It turns out that in November 1991 the current regime, already wobbling even before it got on its feet, was saved by Yeltsin's edict introducing the state of emergency in Checheno-Ingushetia. The same thing occurred in October-November of the next year, 1992, when a mass trade-union movement threatened to sweep away the Dudayev government by a wave of strikes. At that time it was Russian troops that inadvertently gave a helping hand to the Chechen authorities by perpetrating a massacre in the Ingush villages of North Ossetia's Prigorodnyy Rayon.

Apparently, those who claim that the opposing sides do not have significant political differences make a mistake in insisting that both Dudayev's loyalists and the opposition advocate the strengthening of the republic's sovereignty. In my view, there are conceptual differences between Dudayev's loyalists and the opposition regarding not the problem of sovereignty as an abstract slogan, but whether sovereignty should serve, according to Dudayev's opponents, to enrich a small group of people by plundering natural resources and the country's economy, or to create a normal, civilized society with democratic, popularly elected authorities, and a market-based economy free from state and mafia control, as that same opposition urges.

Against this backdrop, it is interesting to look at the social and political forces on which the opposing parties to the confrontation rely.

Those supporting Dudayev are government and semigovernment officials, businessmen linked with the government, and also the presidential guard and paramilitary units close to it. Islamic fundamentalists and residents of a number of Chechnya's mountainous districts have also expressed their solidarity with the president. On the opposite side are nearly the entire national intelligentsia, workers and employees of urban enterprises, schools, hospitals, and oil production facilities. The leader of Chechnya's Muslims, the Council of Heads of Local Administrations of the Chechen Republic, the Council for National and Civil Accord, the Municipal Assembly of Groznyy, and a number of political parties and organizations have also given their backing to the opposition rally.

Most parliamentarians and the Constitutional Court of the Chechen Republic are in the middle of the road between the opposing sides. They continue to waver without taking any definite stand on the conflict. Representatives of the Armed Forces and the Chechen law enforcement agencies have stated their neutrality, and units of Afghan and Abkhaz war veterans have assumed the function of separating the opposing sides.

What dissuades the participants of the confrontation from an open clash is national traditions, including the threat of blood feud. Representatives of both rallies held a meeting where an agreement was reached about the impermissibility of the use of force in the political struggle; it is yet to be seen, however, how effective the agreement will turn out to be.

'Tense' Situation in Ossetia-Ingushetia Zone

PM2304124793 Moscow ROSSIYSKIYE VESTI in Russian 23 Apr 93 p 2

[Alan Kasayev report: "Tense Stability"]

[Text] There continues to be unrest in the Ossetian-Ingush conflict zone.

The very fact that there is stability can only make you think reassuring thoughts. But in combination with the qualifying adjective "tense," it signals, among other things, uncertainty as to the fates of the thousands of refugees from the area of the combat operations, and that it is impossible to carry out spring field operations in most of Prigorodnyy Rayon—one of the republic's main grain-producing areas.

Nor can the suspension of the hostage exchange fail to worry people. It is hard to tell who is right and, if so, to what degree, when both sides are accusing each other of consciously sabotaging the exchange, but both Ingush and Ossetians will be the losers. The periodic statements from the highest-level elected individuals that there are no hostages do not convince the relatives who for several months now have been impatiently awaiting kinfolf missing without trace. Colonel General Yuriy Shatalin, head of the interim administration, cleared up several contentious questions at a meeting with journalists in Vladikavkaz, stating that he is under the direct command of the Russian Federation president and that for the duration of his powers he will act to promote further stabilization using all his rich experience. He stated for the first time that it is time to pay special attention to the difficult fate of the Russian Cossack population in the region where the state of emergency is in force. It is known that the Cossacks' exodus has clearly assumed the proportions of a deportation, and it is simply dangerous to keep quiet about this any longer.

On the subject of the "groundlessness" and "illegality" of operations to search for arms, the interim administration head said that it would be impossible to achieve even the present stabilization without such operations. Through the efforts of military combined units and the militia some 400 firearms, several tens of thousands of rounds of ammunition, more than 100 explosive devices, several infantry fighting vehicles, and even artillery pieces have been confiscated in the conflict zone. On the possibility of a new outbreak of violence, Shatalin assured those assembled that he and the administration under his command will not allow anything of the kind to happen during the period at least through 31 May this year, that is, until the expiry of the Russian president's edict.

Dissatisfaction is being expressed in North Ossetia about the lack of visible progress in the work of the investigation team of the Ministries of Security and Internal Affairs and the Prosecutor's Office to identify those guilty of the mass murders on Prigorodnyy Rayon territory.

Sakhalin Governor on Solution of Islands Dispute

OW2404100793 Tokyo KYODO in English 0935 GMT 24 Apr 93

[Text] Yuzhno-Sakhalinsk, Russia, April 24 KYODO—The new governor of Sakhalin has proposed shelving the resolution of a territorial dispute beteen Japan and Russia, saying the matter should be left to future generations.

In an interview Friday with KYODO NEWS SERVICE, Yevgeniy Krasnoyarov said that "for the time being the state of affairs as evolved through history must be maintained."

The four Russian-held islands claimed by Japan—Kunashiri, Shikotan, Etorofu and the Habomai group of islets—are under Krasnoyarov's jurisdiction.

Japan has for decades called for the return of the islands, which the former Soviet Union seized at the end of World War II.

The territorial dispute, which has been a major obstacle to improving bilateral relations and conclusion of a peace treaty, is expected to figure high on the agenda in discussions with Russian President Boris Yeltsin if his proposed visit to Japan in late May materializes.

Krasnoyarov said the island issue should not be resolved until living standards in Russia and Japan are on the same level, a message which political analysts say apparently came from his fear that the Russian islanders would opt to move to relatively wealthy Japan.

"To let ripen an opportunity for a social solution of the problem, I think it's better to entrust it to our children and grandchildren," he said.

But nevertheless, the governor, who assumed his post on April 8, said he hopes Japan will provide technological and financial support for the economic reconstruction of Sakhalin and the four disputed islands.

Krasnoyarov blamed the present economic crisis on Sakhalin mainly on the forced supply of its local resources to the European part of Russia.

He said the region's economic recovery hinges on its gaining independent management of its own resources.

Pointing to prospective fields of cooperation, he said Japan could help establish modern plants to process and manufacture local goods destined for exports.

International Affairs

Kostenko Denies 'Dragging Out' START Ratification

PM2304144693 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 24 Apr 93 First Edition p 6

[Unattributed report: "Material Prosperity Is the Main Thing"]

[Text] "Accusations that Ukraine is reluctant to ratify the START I Treaty are unfounded. What is happening is the normal process of parliamentary examination of a very important document which will have great significance for Ukraine's national security and, most important, for its material prosperity." This was stated at a press conference by Yuriy Kostenko, chairman of the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet special deputies' commission on questions of ratification of the START I Treaty and minister of environmental conservation.

"We are not dragging out the ratification process, we are studying the matter in depth," Yuriy Kostenko stressed. As he said, the U.S. Congress spent a year and a half examining the treaty, while the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet has been doing so for less than three months. The implementation of nuclear disarmament, Yuriy Kostenko went on, will, according to very rough calculcations, require some 3 billion U.S. dollars. "Such sums must be found from somewhere, since we cannot count particularly on aid from outside (the United States has promised, for instance, only $175 million for these purposes). Yet keeping nuclear weapons costs much less than disarmament."

"Ukraine," Yuriy Kostenko said, "watns to take on commitments it can fulfill. We are also raising the question of destroying nuclear weapons, rather than transporting them from one territory to another. Otherwise security for some countries will be achieved at the cost of reducing security for others."

"From the legal viewpoint Russia is taking an unlawful step by trying to declare the strategic nuclear forces of the former USSR to be its own property," Yuriy Kostenko noted.

Says Disarmament Requires Foreign Aid

LD2504142293 Kiev Radio Ukraine World Service in English 0000 25 Apr 93

[Text] Speaking at a press conference in Kiev after the Verkhovna Rada's closed session deliberations about ratification of the START I Treaty, Ukraine's Minister for Natural Environment Protection and Chairman of the Verkhovna Rada ad hoc Committee on Preparing the Ratification, Yuriy Kostenko, said the nation's nuclear disarmament in the current crisis would require about three billion U.S. dollars. This estimate resulted from a thorough study jointly conducted by leading experts with Ukrainian academic and defense industry enterprises and MPs on related Verkhovna Rada standing committees who considered both the immediate and more distant effects of nuclear disarmament on the national economy as well as its manifold political and societal implications.

Among some crucial aspects of Ukraine's nuclear disarmament, the issue of fissionable materials and their disposal including utilization by the nuclear power industry stood prominent.

The ICBM silos destruction as insisted on by the United States under the START I signed by the United States and the late USSR over a decade ago is also a formidable task involving huge expenditures Ukraine will hardly be able to bear unaided, Mr. Kostenko maintained. He added the ratification issue was closely tied to Ukraine's military doctrine, largely unshaped and unformulated yet. Should the ICBMs be removed from combat duty their maintenance might be highly problematic and environmental risks running too high to be acceptable, the Environmental Protection Minister warned.

While Ukraine is de facto a nuclear power innocent of any international legal norm violations it continues to experience constant pressures on the part of other states, Russia in particular. The latter threatened to discontinue nuclear supplies to Ukraine if Ukraine fails to ratify the START I and join the Non- Proliferation Treaty. In this Russia was immediately joined by France and Canada, Mr. Kostenko complained. He further disclaimed Russia's unilateral and undivided right to all the former USSR's strategic missile warheads, though admitted that Russia alone had capabilities to service them. Mr. Kostenko denied speculation about Ukraine's ICBMs becoming increasingly dangerous through negligence and inadequate maintenance. He said the warheads' life span was far from exhausted.

Kravchuk Aide Urges Meeting With Yeltsin in Sevastopol

MK2304124293 Moscow NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA in Russian 23 Apr 93 p 3

[Interview with Ivan Yermakov, Ukrainian presidential representative in Sevastopol, by Aleksandr Pilat; place and date not given; carried under "Crimea" rubric: "Russian and Ukrainian Presidents Must Meet Again. This Time in Sevastopol"—first four paragraphs are introduction]

[Text] As has been reported, a question on the situation regarding the Black Sea Fleet has been included on the agenda of the 11th Crimean Supreme Soviet session. To investigate this question better and prepare specific proposals to settle the conflicts that have arisen, the Crimean Supreme Soviet commission for military questions held a local session in Sevastopol, inviting interested parties' representatives.

Vice Admiral Petr Svyatashev of the Black Sea Fleet, who spoke at the session, outlined his viewpoint on what is happening in the Black Sea Fleet Military Council and made a number of proposals amounting to the need for the Crimean Supreme Soviet to pay closer attention to the problems of the military units stationed on its territory, and to the need for an immediate return to the Ukrainian Law "On the separation of powers between the organs of state power of Ukraine and the Republic of Crimea," in order to make amendments to it concerning military questions.

Ivan Yermakov, the Ukrainian president's representative in Sevastopol, held a working conference with the command. "Evidently somebody needs to inflame the situation. Our task is not to allow another Dniester region here," Yermakov said.

NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA's correspondent met with Yermakov and asked him to answer a few questions.

[Pilat] What do you see as the solution to the Black Sea Fleet problem?

[Yermakov] A combined fleet under the command of two presidents' commanders is impossible. But since the presidents have so decided I cannot argue, I do not have the right. I am expressing my personal opinion. It turns out that the Black Sea Fleet is apparently under the command of the Ukrainian and Russian presidents, but everybody clearly understands that mainly it is following the orders of the Navy's Russian personnel. Even the Russian Federation defense minister does not particularly interfere.

[Pilat] But if that is so, is it not a clear violation of the Yalta agreement?

[Yermakov] The Black Sea Fleet still has no status, although it should have been determined before 1 October 1992. What exactly do you want if it does not say anywhere what can and cannot be done? Incidentally, the Russian and Ukrainian Government delegations' decision to create a commission to observe the Yalta agreement's implementation, consisting of deputies from the Ukrainian, Russian, and Crimean Supreme Soviets and the Sevastopol City Soviet, has not been implemented either. It turns out that there is now nobody to whom an assessment of the situation that has developed over the Black Sea Fleet can be given. Endless accusations of unilateral violations of the Yalta agreement are coming from both sides—Ukrainian and Russian.

[Pilat] What is the solution?

[Yermakov] I am absolutely convinced that, after the Ukrainian and Russian presidents' meetings in Dagomys and Yalta, a meeting on the Black Sea Fleet problem is needed in Sevastopol. Incidentally, one or two things on this score were decided in my meetings with the Black Sea Fleet and Ukrainian Naval Forces commands, but they will be made public only after the all-Russia referendum.

Crimean Parliament Adopts Resolution on Black Sea Fleet

LD2404085893 Kiev Radio Ukraine World Service in Ukrainian 0700 GMT 24 Apr 93

[Text] The Supreme Council of Crimea has adopted a resolution on implementing the agreement between Ukraine and the Russian Federation on the principles of the formation and functioning of the Naval Forces of Ukraine and the Naval Fleet of Russia on the basis of the former USSR's Black Sea Fleet.

Mindful of the sharpening of the political situation in Crimea connected with dividing the Black Sea Fleet, the resolution says, the Crimean parliament expresses serious concern connected with the absence of a mechanism for implementing the agreement and the status of the transitional period envisaged by the document.

Guided by the law on the delimitation of authorities between the bodies of state power of Ukraine and the Republic of Crimea, taking into account the interests of two friendly states, Ukraine and Russia, and desiring security to be guaranteed in the Black Sea basin, the Supreme Council of Crimea considers it necessary to hold a meeting between the presidents of Ukraine and the Russian Federation in Sevastopol, with participation by the chairman of the Crimean parliament, on issues of implementing the agreement. The Crimean parliament considers it necessary to speed up the resolution of the issue of dual citizenship and the status of Black Sea Fleet sailors who live and serve on the territory of the peninsula.

Invites Yeltsin, Kravchuk to Sevastopol

MK2404121093 Moscow NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA in Russian 24 Apr 93 p 3

[Aleksandr Pilat report under "Crimea" rubric: "'In a Week Will Be Too Late.' Crimean Parliament Invites Yeltsin and Kravchuk to Sevastopol"]

[Text] On 22 April Crimean parliament Speaker Nikolay Bagrov proposed that the next plenary session be held 28 April to discuss, among other remaining questions, the question "On the Observance of the Yalta Agreement on the Black Sea Fleet." However, the deputies commission for military questions that has returned from Sevastopol (it met with the Black Sea Fleet and Ukrainian Naval Forces commands and the city authorities) insisted that this question be considered and solved before the recess in the session proceedings. Andrey Menyaylov, commission deputy chairman, stated that in a week would be too late.

As a result of a long debate the Crimean Supreme Soviet adopted a decree "On the Implementation of the Agreement Between Ukraine and the Russian Federation on the Principles of the Formation and Functioning of Ukrainian and Russian Naval Forces on the Basis of the Former USSR's Black Sea Fleet." It says that the Crimean Supreme Soviet is extremely concerned over the "exacerbation of the political situation in the Crimea associated with the Black Sea Fleet's disintegration," and it expresses "serious concern over the lack of a mechanism to implement the agreement on the transitional period envisioned by the agreement."

The Crimean Supreme Soviet considers it necessary to hold a meeting of the Ukrainian and Russian presidents in Sevastopol with the participation of the Crimean Supreme Soviet chairman. The Crimean parliament has requested that the Ukrainian president include Crimean Supreme Soviet deputies in the Black Sea Fleet working group (group of experts) and that he suspend the validity of the Ukrainian Defense Minister's Order No. 65 of 8 April 1993, "On the Appointment of Commanders of Garrisons on Republic of Crimea Territory," because this order conflicts with the Ukrainian law "On the Separation of Powers Between the Organs of State Power of Ukraine and the Republic of Crimea."

The Crimean parliament considered it very important to speed up the solution of the question of the dual citizenship and status of Black Sea Fleet servicemen living on Crimean territory and performing service here.

Naval Officers Issue Appeal Over Black Sea Fleet

LD2304175493 Kiev Radio Ukraine World Service in Ukrainian 2200 GMT 22 Apr 93

[Text] An appeal made by the Union of Officers of the Naval Forces of Ukraine has been circulated among the deputies of the Crimean Supreme Council, who gathered for a routine sitting of the session of the Crimean parliament. The appeal has been necessitated by the situation in the Black Sea Fleet.

In actual fact, the subordination of the Black Sea Fleet to the Russian Defense Ministry continues, the statement stresses. The fleet continues to receive and execute the orders of the Russian Defense Ministry. The Russian flags have been unilaterally raised on board many ships, the officers note. The redeployment of the Black Sea Fleet ships goes on, unknown to the Crimean and Ukrainian Supreme Councils.

The Union of Officers of the Naval Forces of Ukraine requests that the deputies use their authority to put an end to the interference of the Russian Defense Ministry in the internal affairs of Crimea and Ukraine, as well as to secure adherence to the Dagomys and Yalta agreements.

Our opinion is that, if these agreements do not work, they should be denounced, and a new meeting between the presidents should be convened for them finally to specify the status of the Black Sea Fleet and step up the establishment of the Ukraine Naval Forces and the Russian Navy, based on the Black Sea Fleet, the statement notes.

Kuchma News Conference on Mideast Visit, Other Issues

LD2304122193 Kiev UKRINFORM in Ukrainian 1651 GMT 22 Apr 93

[Excerpts] [no dateline as received] Ukraine's peaceful breakthrough to countries of the Arabian peninsula. This is how one could characterize the visit of the Ukrainian Government delegation headed by Prime Minister Leonid Kuchma to the Sultanate of Oman, the state of Qatar, Saudi Arabia, the United Arab Emirates, and Kuwait from 10 to 18 April. The point is that not a single republic of the former Soviet Union has sent such a representative delegation to these countries before this. A news conference for Ukrainian and foreign journalists in Kiev on 22 April covered the main results of the visit. [passage omitted]

The prime minister said that the Arab countries expressed great interest in cooperation with Ukraine. Their leaders stated their intention to send delegations to us to continue talks on determining the main directions of future cooperation. Speaking about the achievements of the states the delegation visited, Leonid Kuchma, not so much as prime minister but simply as a man, called these achievements fantastic, especially in the social sphere—free education, free medical care... [punctuation as received] As prime minister he added that, having been in these states, he was again convinced that reforms only work when there is strong power in a country. [passage omitted]

The prime minister replied to a number of other questions too, many of which were not directly connected with the results of the visit.

Views Military Cooperation With Gulf States

MK2404103493 Moscow NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA in Russian 24 Apr 93 p 1

[Vladimir Skachko report published in "Ukraine" column: "'The East Understands Us Better Than the West or the United States.' Leonid Kuchma Government To Press Parliament To Extend Emergency Powers"]

[Text] Speaking in Kiev on 22 April at a press conference devoted to the results of the nine-day visit by a government delegation led by Leonid Kuchma to Persian Gulf countries, the Ukrainian prime minister said that, first, the republic's government will demand that the Supreme Soviet extend and even strengthen emergency economic powers, and second, that he is not going to retreat from the course toward further strengthening the executive power hierarchy.

Responding to the question about what worries him the most in Ukraine, Leonid Kuchma said: "The reforms need to be pursued by a strong executive power. So far we do not have it." Asked about the concrete results of the struggle against the mafia and about the possible acceleration of privatization, the prime minister said that the government has no real mechanisms either to fight the mafia or to carry through privatization, and therefore in May it will call for a crackdown on crime and, with the aim of speeding up privatization, demand that the State Property Fund and the Ukrainian National Bank, which, as is known, are under parliament jurisdiction, be placed under the control of the cabinet of ministers. Having said that privatization should in a certain sense be pursued by "forceful measures," Leonid Kuchma said, however, that large industrial enterprises so far must remain under state ownership. According to Leonid Kuchma, the latest reshuffles in the government are designed to consolidate executive power, in particular the fact that Viktor Pinzenik has retained the post of vice premier in charge of economic reform and also the appointment of Yuriy Bannikov as minister of the economy, who in the premier's opinion is a high-class professional. According to Leonid Kuchma, Viktor Pinzenik has long been asking for relief from responsibility of holding two positions simultaneously, while former Vice Premier Igor Yukhnovskiy "has overestimated his own abilities."

Leonid Kuchma also said that in spite of the personal support from Leonid Kravchuk and Ivan Plyushch, he cannot as yet fully "control the deputies who may make any decisions in the sphere of economics," citing the instance when during a budget debate they increased the value added tax rate, introduced a mechanism whereby not enterprise profits but their gross revenues are subject to taxation, and tried to exempt enterprises from the mandatory requirement to sell hard-currency income to the state.

Amazingly little was said at the press conference about Russia. Leonid Kuchma only stated that today Russia cannot alone service the missiles without assistance from specialists of the Yuzhmash plant, where they were produced.

Commenting on the results of the visit to the Persian Gulf countries, Kuchma noted that "the visit was very warm, but basically of a get-acquainted nature. The Ukrainian side spoke about Ukraine's potential while leaders of Arab countries spoke about what interested them most."

Stating that no concrete accords were reached on deliveries of energy or other materials to Ukraine from the Arabian Peninsula, Leonid Kuchma nonetheless said that the Arab countries expressed their interest in Ukrainian assistance in prospecting and producing gas, oil, and water, building oil and gas pipelines and dams, and also in metallurgy and shipbuilding. Leonid Kuchma said that the question of collaboration in the military sphere was also discussed. In particular, asked about the prospects for deliveries to Arab countries of products of the Ukrainian military-industrial complex, the prime minister observed: "Why talk in terms of prospects; why not today?"

Touching on the problems of political collaboration with the Persian Gulf countries, Leonid Kuchma described many positions as similar.

Winding up the press conference, Leonid Kuchma stated: "I have the impression that the East understands us better than the West and the United States. Perhaps because 20 or 30 years ago they were just where we are now."

National Affairs

Parliament Continues Discussion of Military Doctrine

MK2404123893 Moscow NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA in Russian 24 Apr 93 p 3

[Vladimir Skachko report under "Ukraine" rubric: "Military Doctrine Rejected Again. Moldovan Supreme Soviet Speaker Petr Luchinskiy Speaks in Parliament"]

[Text] Deputies continued discussion of Ukraine's draft military doctrine at a closed parliamentary session on 22 April. Sergey Semenets, deputy chairman of the special working group for nuclear disarmament questions, stated that the document had been severely criticized.

Several options for a solution were proposed, specifically to adopt it as a basis and send it for finalization, to remove Paragraph 1/5, which enshrines Ukraine's nonnuclear status and prohibits it from developing technologies based on new physical principles, and so on. There was even a proposal to make Ukraine's nonnuclear status conditional in the said paragraph on its being granted permanent membership of the UN Security Council as the chief guarantee of security.

Not one of the proposals was passed, however, and no decision was adopted. According to Deputy Vasiliy Izmalkov, this was because Ukraine does not yet have formulated priorities in either domestic or foreign policy, and consequently does not have them in the military sphere.

It is interesting that the military doctrine was accused of pacifism by both national democrats and nationalists and representatives of the opposite camp. In particular, Socialist Party leader Aleksandr Moroz had this to say about Paragraph 1/5: "For Ukraine the manufacture of, for example, nuclear weapon components is the extent of its science and advanced technologies, and means ultimately its economy and the employment of many thousands of people."

Moldovan Supreme Soviet Speaker Petr Luchinskiy, head of the parliamentary delegation and who is currently in Ukraine, addressed the deputies in the evening session. He assured the Ukrainian parliament that Moldova, having adopted a new constitution, will remain an autonomous state and that relations with Ukraine will be built on the principles of good-neighborliness and respect for territorial integrity. Luchinskiy stressed that the guarantees of good relations between the two countries are respect for and the realization of the rights of Moldovans in Ukraine and of Ukrainians in Moldova, and the development of their cultures, languages, and traditions.

Decides To Amend Doctrine

LD2604125993 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service in English 1100 GMT 26 Apr 93

[Text] The Ukrainian parliament has decided that Ukraine's military doctrine it discussed for several days must be amended with a number of deputies rejecting the clause which says that Ukraine adheres to nonnuclear principles and opposes the proliferation of existing technologies for the production of nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons and the development of new ones. According to them this will turn Ukraine into a backward country and halt scientific progress. At the same time some deputies reportedly see in the doctrine rapprochement with NATO and a belittling of relations with Russia.

Kravchuk Meets Cossacks, Says Ukraine To Be 'Strong'

LD2404104993 Kiev Radio Ukraine World Service in Ukrainian 0700 GMT 24 Apr 93

[Text] Ukraine is not intending to change its declared status of a nonnuclear state, but it should be a strong, democratic, and lawful country which is respected for its policies and its role in Europe and the world, said Ukrainian President Leonid Kravchuk at a meeting with representatives of Ukrainian Cossacks. Special attention was paid to issues of developing the Ukrainian state, establishing its own armed forces, reviving Cossack traditions, educating young people in a patriotic way, and shaping national self-awareness. It was emphasized that the Cossacks could play a large role in strengthening the state, not allowing enmity to be stirred up, and also in assisting friendship between peoples, in particular between the Ukrainian and the Russian peoples.

Kravchuk Wants Better Aid for Chernobyl Victims

LD2404105793 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1720 GMT 23 Apr 93

[By UKRINFORM corespondent Sergey Balykov for TASS]

[Excerpts] Kiev, 23 Apr (ITAR-TASS)—State aid for the victims of the accident at Chernobyl AES [nuclear electric power station] which occurred on 26 April seven yers ago should be more effective and specific. Ukrainian President Leonid Kravchuk said this today at a meeting with representatives of the "Chernobyl Alliance" of Ukraine and the Ukrainian national foundation for helping the invalids of Chernobyl. [passage omitted]

Leonid Kravchuk spoke in favor of preparing an international treaty between Ukraine, Russia, and Belarus which would make it possible for Ukrainians involved in eliminating the accident at Chernobyl AES, and its victims, to be treated in the best clinics of the neighboring countries and vice versa.

The president of Ukraine issued an instruction to the heads of ministries and departments to prepare, by May, jointly with representatives of the Chernobyl public organizations, a program for providing aid to the victims of the accident at Chernobyl AES for this year and for the long-term.

Azerbaijan

Elchibey Reviews Talks With Ter-Petrosyan

NC2304193893 Baku TURAN in English 1509 GMT 23 Apr 93

[Text] Baku, April 23 (TURAN)—After coming back from Ankara the president of Azerbaijan said to TURAN correspondent that during the negotiations with the president of Armenia the agreement about "the necessity of removal of hostility between two nations for the last five years" was achieved.

Elchibey noted that the main condition of the peaceful end is the settlement of the conflict within the limits of CSCE Minsk group. "We do not see one more alternative," Elchibey said.

Speaking about Geneva negotiations stopping the president stressed that the decision of negotiations stopping was admitted by the members of Minsk group, who made terms to reopen them in case of withdrawing of Armenian occupation units from Kelbadzharskiy.

"President Ter-Petrosyan and me expressed the willingness to obey any CSCE decision and accomplish it together."

The president of Azerbaijan disproved the information about his appealing to foreign countries for military assistance. "In [word indistinct] such kind of action is senseless," Elchibey said.

'Too Early' To Discuss Results

NC2404160793 Baku AZERTAC in English 1502 GMT 24 Apr 93

[Text] Baku, April, 24 (AZERTAC)—It's obvious that the conflict between Armenia and Azerbaijan has already exceeded the limits of two republics. Heads of many states, who have arrived for President Turgut Ozal's funerals to Turkey, have confirmed that fact once more. President Abulfaz Elchibey stated at the press conference given for representatives of local and foreign mass media today.

The fact that the USA, Russia, Kazakhstan, Georgia, had offered separately from each other to arrange a meeting between presidents of Armenia and Azerbaijan was stressed at the press conference. The initiative of those states has been supported by Turkey. It was supposed that the meeting between presidents of Armenia and Azerbaijan would be an incentive for both countries to reach compromise.

However president pointed out that it was too early to talk about results of future negotiations. We are aware that a number of negotiations on peaceful solution of the conflict have ended in the escalation of military operations of Armenia against Azerbaijan, capture of our cities and villages. Thousands of Azeri civilians have become refugees in their own country.

Then president answered to questions of journalists.

Elchibey Holds Briefing, Says Russia Prolonging Conflict

NC2404153693 Baku TURAN in English 1402 GMT 24 Apr 93

[Text] Baku April 24 (TURAN)—"The interests of great powers play first fiddle in Armenian-Azerbaijanian conflict and more important than positions of the leaders of Armenia and Azerbaijan", the President of Azerbaijan Abulfaz Elchibey announced on todays press-conference.

According to A. Elchibey, Russia and France do all possible to delay the consideration of the problem of Kelbadzharskiy capture in the UN Security Council. Instead of it Moscow suggests to solve the problem outside the CSCE and UN. The purpose is that to gain time and ease the pressure on Armenia.

As an example President Elchibey called the position of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Russia which tries to exert pressure on Azerbaijan so that Baku would enter the negotiation with Yerevan outside the CSCE Minsk group.

According to A. Elchibey the imperial forces in Russian generals and conservatives in Moscow carry on a campaign to restore the USSR. The attempt to consolidate the republics of the CIS is the first step. In case of coming to power of the conservatives in Russia they will try to establish a unitary state on the basis of the CIS.

Answering TURAN agency question about the probability of Azerbaijan joining to the CIS Elchibey said that this probability came to nothing.

Speaking about the forthcoming referendum in Russia the president of Azerbaijan noted that Yeltsin's resignation may lead to the disintegration of Russia.

U.S. Embassy Delivers Note to Foreign Ministry on Conflict

NC2404155993 Baku TURAN in English 1402 GMT 24 Apr 93

[Text] Baku, April 24 (TURAN)—On April 24 the American Embassy in Azerbaijan handed the note to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Azerbaijan. This note reflects the position of the USA concerning the last events in Armenian-Azeri conflict zone.

In particular it is noted that the USA speak in support of a continuation of agreement in force about cease-fire achieved by the CSCE mission on April 20-22. In the meantime it is stressed in the note that "all ethnic Armenian forces must be taken out from Kelbadzharskiy region".

It is stressed in the note that "ethnic Armenians" control keeping over the captured territories is not acceptable to the USA.

Presidential Adviser Receives Visiting CSCE Delegation

NC2304194393 Baku TURAN in English 1509 GMT 23 Apr 93

[Text] Baku, April 23 (TURAN)—Today the state counselor of the president of the Republic on foreign policy Vafa Guluzade received the members of CSCE preparatory mission: the head of the group—Colonel Hepponen and diplomatic counselors of the mission Farneri and Troedsen.

During the conversation Hepponen informed that the result of the trip to Karabakh was the achievement of cease-fire and stopping of all military actions in this region. According to Hepponen the prerequisites were created to continue CSCE peacemaking efforts.

The mission members noted that during their meetings with Armenian leaders of Karabakh [State Defense Committee Chairman Robert] Kocharyan and [Supreme Soviet Chairman Georgiy] Petrosyan they did not hear "uncompromising, hard positions." According to the CSCE representatives it lets to draw a conclusion about the possibility of political stratagems and negotiations.

In his turn Guluzade noted that the president of Azerbaijan stressed constantly that the CSCE was the only mechanism for this conflict settlement. At the same time he noted that peace in the region might be achieved if by chance Azeris expatriated from Karabakh would return to their homes and Armenians would admit Karabakh is Azerbaijan territory. "The military victories of Armenians may create the certain illusions but everybody must remember that Azeris will never agree with them," noted Guluzade.

Today the CSCE mission left Baku for Vienna where they would prepare the technical report about the results of the trip.

Georgia

Russian Forces Protest 'Unauthorized Seizures of Property'

LD2304161193 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1455 GMT 23 Apr 93

[Report by ITAR-TASS correspondent Albert Kochetkov]

[Text] Tbilisi, 23 Apr—Unauthorized seizures of property belonging to the Russian Group of Forces in the Transcaucasus [RGFT] are continuing in Georgia. In this connection, the RGFT's press center today issued a statement addressed to the republic's leadership. Mkhedrioni armed formations inter alia seized the group's sports depot, whose building adjoined army storage facilities belonging to the signallers. To all appearances, it was an infringement of the fire safety regulations, which caused the blaze that led to the total destruction of the storage facilities.

Among similar incidents, the press center cites the unauthorized seizure by Georgian National Guards of a military cantonment belonging to a Russian chemical defense unit in Tbilisi, whose property and special equipment were stolen or destroyed.

The RGFT command proposes to the republic's leadership that,on matters concerning relations with the Russian Army,it be guided by the provisions of the draft treaty on the duration and status of its presence in the territory of Georgia, which regulates matters regarding the legal protection of its units and servicemen.

Chikvaidze, Russian Envoy Call For Abkhazia Talks

LD2404133293 Tbilisi Radio Tbilisi Network in Georgian 0800 GMT 24 Apr 93

[Text] Georgia's Foreign Minister Aleksandr Chikvaidze met with Vladimir Zemskiy, ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary of the Russian Federation to Georgia. The ambassador briefed the minister on the CIS summit meeting in Minsk and its unequivocal support for Russia's democratic forces. On behalf of his government, he thanked the Georgian leadership for its strong support of the victory of democracy in Russia and for carrying out the reforms.

Then the Abkhazian events were discussed. Aleksandr Chikvaidze particularly stressed that the main paragraph of the protocol on a ceasefire, which was signed in Sochi, has been breached on several occassions by the Abkhazian side. This time, Sukhumi is being bombed with long range artillery shells which the separatists do not have in their arsenal. As a result of all this, the civil population is being killed and residential and office buildings are destroyed.

Vladimir Zemskiy said that the most effective instrument for settling the conflict should be a trilateral meeting which could be organized after the Russian referendum has been held. The minister said that the Georgian side agreed with this and it has said so on many occassions. Postponement of such a meeting, he said, would result in more casualties and exacerbate the abnormal relations as they are now, even more, between Georgia and Russia.

'Sources' Say Russia To Help Storm Sukhumi

LD2504161193 Tbilisi CONTACT INFORMATION AGENCY in Russian 1604 GMT 24 Apr 93

[Text] [No dateline as received] According to reliable sources, the CONTACT agency reports that a major offensive on Sukhumi is expected any day now. It is worth noting that the plan to storm the town was worked out in Moscow and that high-ranking military officers from the general staff of the Russian Defense Ministry were involved.

It can now be said with conviction that Russia's policy toward the Transcaucasus is manifestly aggressive. Even Moscow officials do not hide that fact. Despite the democratic reforms taking place there, Russian imperialist forces do not want to lose their influence throughout the territory of the former Soviet Union.

It has emerged that, before storming Sukhumi, the Abkhaz side will, with Russian help, carry out a major military operation involving aircraft, Grad rocket launchers, and up to 3,000 personnel. They have undergone training near Moscow.

Clearly Russian and Abkhaz reactionaries will not flinch from bombing Sukhumi again, particularly since they think that there are no longer any Abkhazians in the town.

According to available information, members of the fascist organization, Pamyat, will also take part in this operation. According to Pamyat's leader, they are to receive their baptism of fire on the territory of Abkhazia.

The storming of Sukhumi is expected to occur on Russian referendum day. That would allow the Russian authorities to explain the involvement of their troops in this operation as being due to political instability in the country and a loss of control over military departments.

Abkhazia Welcomes Tbilisi's 22 Apr Call To End War

LD2604092593 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 0805 GMT 26 Apr 93

[By ITAR-TASS correspondent Vadim Byrkin]

[Text] Moscow, 26 Apr—The Abkhazian Supreme Soviet welcomes the Georgian parliament's 22 April appeal to the Abkhaz people. A statement by the Supreme Soviet of Abkhazia released today points out that "for the first time in eight months Georgia's parliament has finally called not for general mobilization and continuation of the bloodshed, but for an end to the war." "If Georgia's parliament really has renounced the use of force to resolve the problem of relations between Abkhazia and Georgia, and is sincere in its declaration about the need to end the war," it is believed in Gudauta, this can be confirmed by withdrawal of troops from Abkhazia, and the Abkhaz side is ready to discuss the mechanism for this.

Kitovani Signs Military Censorship Law

LD2304213993 Moscow ITAR-TASS World Service in Russian 1800 GMT 23 Apr 93

[Report by TASS freelance correspondent Nugzar Kereselidze]

[Text] Sukhumi, 23 Apr—Georgia's Defense Minister Tengiz Kitovani has signed an order subjecting all news obtained by journalists in the conflict zone to military censorship. Implementation of this part of the decree is entrusted to officers of the news service of the second army corps. The same service is also required to register every journalist arriving in the zone. Failure by military personnel or civilians to carry out the order will be punishable under military law.

Gamsakhurdia Supporter Joins Kitovani Forces

NC2304193393 Yerevan SNARK in English 1421 GMT 23 Apr 93

[Text] Tbilisi, April 23 (SNARK)—Loti Kobalia, one of the Georgian ex-president associates, together with troops and equipment under his command came to Ochamchira April 22. Tengiz Kitovani Georgian defence minister and Valeriy Kvaraia, commander of the 2nd Military Corps, met Kobalia. Georgian leader Shevardnadze have saluted the joining of Mengreliya troops within Georgian Army fighting in Abkhazia. "I always hoped that all regions of Megreliya would fight for independence and integrity of Georgia", said Shevardnadze. Loti Kobalia himself is agree to create with Abkhazians a united military troop to control law in the conflict region.

Shevardnadze Meets With CSCE Mission Chief

LD2404085593 Tbilisi Radio Tbilisi Network in Georgian 0200 GMT 24 Apr 93

[Text] Eduard Shevardnadze, chairman of the Georgian Parliament and head of state, yesterday met with Istvan Djarmati, head of the CSCE mission to Georgia. They talked about the processes under way in Abkhazia. The leader of the mission told the head of state of the impressions of his visit.

Shevardnadze, Turkey's Demirel on Yerevan-Baku Mediation

MK2304122093 Moscow NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA in Russian 23 Apr 93 p 3

[Vladislav Kuzmichev report under "Initiative" rubric: "Shevardnadze Intends To Reconcile Yerevan and Baku. Demirel Supports Him"]

[Text] In a conversation with Turkish Republic Prime Minister Demirel before his departure from Ankara after President Ozal's funeral, Eduard Shevardnadze exchanged opinions with him on the situation in the world and the region, specifically in the Transcaucasus. The Turkish prime minister expressed satisfaction regarding the beginning of direct summit-level Armenian-Azerbaijani talks, which were organized in Ankara on Georgia's initiative and with its mediation. "We have paid due regard to your efforts and diplomatic artistry," Demirel said. "At the same time we too have been trying to organize this meeting, but unsuccessfully. What you have achieved is a good and encouraging beginning."

Shevardnadze outlined to Demirel his ideas concerning the organization of a dialogue between Transcaucasus state leaders on a permanent basis: "We have agreed that after the bilateral meeting of Presidents Elchibey and Ter-Petrosyan we will get the complete 'Transcaucasian' membership together and discuss the principles of peaceful cooperation, whose aim is peace and security in the region and above all the settlement of existing conflicts."

Demirel stressed that all internal conflicts lost their localized character long ago and are now affecting life in neighboring countries. He expressed concern over the situation regarding Karabakh and Abkhazia, saying that the restoration of peace and law and order in the region is a matter for all states.

Agreeing with him, Shevardnadze noted that "the political settlement of the conflict in Abkhazia could be reached by the sides actually involved in it. The Georgians and Abkhazians have nothing to share but unfortunately, acting in their own mercenary interests, external forces are closing the road toward peace. The painful imperial legacy is being overcome with enormous resistance, and for this reason the Caucasus factor must become one of the main factors in international politics."

The Turkish prime minister stated that his government is prepared to continue giving comprehensive aid to Georgia, one of the region's key countries.

"It is the Caucasus that will open up a wonderful prospect for cooperation between the states of Europe and Asia. There are several promising projects on this score," Shevardnadze said, "in whose implementation Iran, Ukraine, Moldova, the Caspian region countries, and the Baltic countries are interested besides us.

END OF
FICHE
DATE FILMED

29 APRIL 1993